

Wellesley story

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by

Mr. A. A. Sweet

Nº 32213





THE
Old Testament
Student.

WILLIAM R. HARPER, Ph. D., Editor.

VOLUME VI.

September, 1886—June, 1887.

THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., P. O. Drawer 15.

For Sale by CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 743-745 Broadway, New York.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SEPTEMBER.

I.	EDITORIAL.....	1- 4
II.	DIVISIONS OF THE DECALOGUE. <i>Talbot W. Chambers, D. D.</i>	5- 10
III.	SHEKHAR AND LEAVEN IN MOSAIC OFFERINGS. <i>Prest. Abrah Hovey, D. D.</i>	11- 16
IV.	ETHICAL VALUE OF PAGAN RELIGIONS. <i>Justin A. Smith, D. D.</i>	17- 21
V.	THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	22- 24
VI.	THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET. <i>Prof. Edward L. Curtis, Ph. D.</i>	25, 26
VII.	UNROLLING THE MUMMY OF RAMESES THE GREAT.....	26, 27
VIII.	BOOK NOTICES.....	28- 31
IX.	CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.....	32

OCTOBER.

I.	EDITORIAL.....	33- 37
II.	PRIMEVAL CHINESE LEGENDS. <i>Rev. J. Edkins, D. D.</i>	38- 43
III.	NEW TESTAMENT JUDAISM AND ITS GENESIS. <i>Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.</i>	44 47
IV.	THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	47- 51
V.	A BOOK-STUDY: ISAIAH XL-LXVI. <i>Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine, D. D.</i>	51- 54
VI.	THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. <i>Prof. F. B. Dento</i>	55- 58
VII.	HOW TO SEE PALESTINE.....	58- 60
VIII.	BOOK NOTICES.....	61- 63
IX.	CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.....	64

NOVEMBER.

I.	EDITORIAL.....	65- 68
II.	PALESTINE EXPLORATION: WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE. <i>Prof. J. W. McGarvey</i>	69, 70
III.	THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. II. <i>Prof. F. B. Dento</i>	71- 76
IV.	MUST WE FOLLOW THE NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION OF OLD TESTAMENT TEXTS? <i>Prof. Franz Delitzsch</i>	77, 78
V.	THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	78, 79
VI.	A CHAPTER-STUDY. JACOB'S BLESSING (Gen. XLIX.) <i>By the Editor</i>	79- 83
VII.	COMMENTARIES ON EXODUS. <i>Prof. Francis Brown, D. D.</i>	84- 91
VIII.	OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.....	92- 95
IX.	CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.....	96

DECEMBER.

I.	EDITORIAL.....	97-100
II.	THE LITERARY PROBLEM OF GENESIS I.-III. <i>Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.</i>	101-105
III.	RELIGION AS AN ELEMENT IN CIVILIZATION. <i>J. A. Smith, D. D.</i>	106-109
IV.	HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY. <i>Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D.</i>	110-113
V.	THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	113-117
VI.	A BOOK-STUDY. PART I. (Gen. I. XL.) <i>By the Editor</i>	117-122
VII.	OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.....	123-125
VIII.	BOOK NOTICES.....	126, 127
IX.	CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.....	128

JANUARY.

I.	EDITORIAL.....	129, 130
II.	BIBLE-STUDY IN THE PASTORATE: FIGURES AND FACTS. <i>By the Editor</i>	131-135
III.	SOME FEATURES OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY ILLUSTRATED BY THE BOOK OF AMOS. <i>Prof. Edward L. Curtis, Ph. D.</i>	136 139
IV.	PITHOM: NAVILLE AND HIS REVIEWERS. <i>Rev. C. R. Gillett</i>	139-145
V.	THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	145-150
VI.	HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY. II. <i>Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D.</i>	150-153
VII.	W. M. L. DE WETTE. <i>Rev. W. W. Everts, Jr.</i>	154, 155
VIII.	OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.....	156-159
IX.	CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.....	160

FEBRUARY.

I. EDITORIAL	161-163
II. A BOOK-STUDY: PART II. (Gen. xii.-L.) <i>By the Editor</i>	164-166
III. HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY. III. <i>Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D.</i>	166-170
IV. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	170-173
V. AN EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH LIII, 11, 12. <i>Benjamin Douglass</i>	173-175
VI. THE ANTI-DILUVIAN CHRONOLOGY. <i>George Dana Boardman, D. D.</i>	175, 176
VII. THE PRAYER OF HABAKKUK. <i>Geo. A. Barton, M. A.</i>	176-178
VIII. REPORT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF SCHOOLS OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HEBREW	
IX. REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HEBREW	178-184
X. THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HEBREW	185, 186
XI. BOOK NOTICES	187-189
XII. CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE	190 191 192

MARCH.

I. EDITORIAL	193-195
II. THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE BY COLLEGE-STUDENTS. <i>By the Editor</i>	196-202
III. A BOOK-STUDY: EXODUS. <i>By the Editor</i>	203-208
IV. FRANZ DELITZSCH. <i>Prof. Hermann V. Hilprecht, Ph. D.</i>	209-213
V. AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN PALESTINE. <i>Prof. E. C. Mitchell, D. D.</i>	213-219
VI. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	219-221
VII. OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES	222
VIII. BOOK NOTICES	223
IX. CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE	224

APRIL.

I. EDITORIAL	225-228
II. POPULAR USES OF THE MARGIN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISION. <i>Prof. J. F. McCurdy, Ph. D.</i>	229-234
III. LETTER I.—TO A PASTOR WHO WISHES TO KNOW HOW HE MAY STUDY THE BOOK OF PSALMS TO HIS OWN BEST ADVANTAGE AND THAT OF HIS CONGREGATION. <i>Prof. Rev. F. Weidner, D. D.</i>	235-237
IV. THE INCONGRUOUS CLAUSE IN GENESIS XIII, 10. <i>Prof. W. W. Moore, D. D.</i>	237-240
V. THE WORD ELOHIM IN GENESIS I. <i>Prof. R. V. Foster, D. D.</i>	241-243
VI. THE CAPTIVITY. WHO WERE THESE PEOPLE AND WHERE WAS THEIR ORIGINAL HOME? <i>Rev. A. Hallen</i>	243-245
VII. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	246-249
VIII. OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES	250-252
IX. BOOK NOTICES	253-255
X. CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE	256

MAY.

I. EDITORIAL	257-260
II. THE PERFECTION OF THE DECALOGUE. <i>Talbot W. Chambers, D. D.</i>	261-268
III. THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION.—RECENT PHASES. <i>Prof. Henry P. Smith, D. D.</i>	268-270
IV. A BOOK-STUDY: HOSEA. <i>Prof. F. B. Denio, M. A.</i>	270-273
V. AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN BIBLE-LANDS. <i>Prof. E. C. Mitchell, D. D.</i>	273-274
VI. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	274-282
VII. OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES	283-285
VIII. BOOK NOTICES	286, 287
IX. CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE	288

JUNE.

I. EDITORIAL	289-292
II. ISRAELITISH POLITICS AS AFFECTED BY ASSYRIAN, BABYLONIAN AND EARLY ARAMEAN KINGS. <i>Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D.</i>	293-302
III. THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF EXPLORATION. A LIST OF AMERICAN WRITERS UPON BIBLICAL ARCHEOLOGY AND THE WORK OF EXPLORATION IN BIBLE LANDS, WITH THE SUBJECTS THEY HAVE DISCUSSED, INCLUDING REVIEW AND MAGAZINE ARTICLES AS WELL AS SEPARATE BOOKS. <i>Prof. E. C. Mitchell, D. D.</i>	303-315
IV. IS THE CURRENT CRITICAL DIVISION OF THE PENTATEUCH INIMICAL TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH? <i>Prof. William Henry Green, D. D., LL. D.</i>	315-318
V. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS. <i>Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D.</i>	319-322
VI. OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES	323-325
VII. BOOK NOTICES	326, 327
VIII. CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE	328
IX. GENERAL INDEX TO VOL. VI.	329-332

➤THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.◀

VOL. VI.

SEPTEMBER, 1886.

NO. I.

WITH this number THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT enters upon its sixth volume. Few journals ever began under more inauspicious circumstances. Even its best friends doubted the possibility of its establishment. The difficulties in the way of its success have at times seemed altogether insuperable; yet, one by one, they have been overcome. Those who have so kindly rendered aid are gratefully remembered; without their assistance, the effort would long ago have failed. We may, however, now look forward, with reasonable assurance, to a more certain future. THE STUDENT has made for itself a place in the periodical literature of the day, and this place it will seek with each new volume to fill more worthily.

A LEADING characteristic of the numerous articles on the Revision has been their exceeding monotony and dullness. This holds true even of those which are to be regarded as the most valuable. Quite different in this respect from the great majority of such articles is that of Prof. Charles R. Brown in the July *Bibliotheca Sacra*, to be concluded in the October number. The writer, by an ingenious method, presents his material in a form which at once commends it to the attention of the reader. In order to perform his task exhaustively he limits himself to the Book of Genesis. He considers the text, the grammar, the lexicography and the English of the Revision, by indicating in one column the changes which the revisers have made and in a parallel column the changes which, in his opinion, they ought to have made. The article, with the material which it contains, the frankness of its criticism and the freshness of its presentation, deserves the special notice of all who are interested in Bible-translation. It furnishes a good specimen of what may be called solid work.

How many there are who suppose that with a slight knowledge of grammar, and a small vocabulary, one has all that is needed to do exegetical work. These even suppose that the translation of a given passage according to grammatical rules is its interpretation. Sight is lost of the fact that language, even when most carefully expressed, is ambiguous, and that to no two individuals does the same language convey the same thought. The following sentiment expressed by Dr. A. C. Kendrick in the course of his comment on a difficult passage (1 Cor. XV. 27), deserves careful consideration :

“ We have thus far dealt with the facts and the logic of the matter. We have looked at the historical evidence, the nature of the usage and finally at the logical exigencies of the passage. We regard this latter evidence as decisive, both as to what the meaning of the passage is not and what it is. We have no right, indeed, to force our own meaning into an author's train of thought, but we have a right to draw his meaning out of it. We may rightly presume that he will lead us toward the goal toward which his footsteps are regularly tending. We may surely make logical consistency an important element in interpretation. Man is something more than a mere grammar-grinder. The lexicon is not the whole of exegesis. Logic and rhetoric—the law of thought and the law of passion—are mightier than grammar, and will ever furnish the most decisive elements in the interpretation of human speech. We can never rest in our exposition until the logical demands of the passage are satisfied. However seemingly encompassed in grammatical rules, it will refuse to lie still, but will arise and haunt us with the ghost of a murdered thought. When, on the contrary, the difficulties of thought have resolved themselves, we easily dispose, especially in an energetic and impassioned writer, of some difficulties of expression. We shall find the language easily yield to the demand of the thought.”

DOES the average minister make such use of his Bible, aside from his use of it for devotional purposes, as, in view of the character of the Book, and of the relation which it sustains to his profession, he ought to make? He goes to it every week, it is true, for a text or two; yet how comparatively seldom is it that the sermon preached grows out of the text itself. He prepares, of course, the current Sunday-school lesson, but here again the whole aim is a homiletical one. Now we grant freely that the minister must be a preacher, that in his work he must have in mind the practical application of the great truths of divine revelation. But, we believe, that minister errs most grievously both against himself, his people, and the cause of God, who studies his Bible exclusively from the homiletical stand-point, unless, perhaps, the word homiletical is to be used in a sense which it does not generally convey.

The difficulty, briefly stated, is this: Men study the Bible narrowly, not broadly; superficially, not deeply; for immediate, and not

for permanent results. The question *is*, What can I get out of this passage for my next sermon, or my next lecture? The question *ought to be*, What does this passage teach? What is its place in the great body of divine truth? Let the pastor, aside from his devotional study, his sermonizing, his preparation for the Bible-class, do a comprehensive, systematic Bible-work which looks not to immediate, but to permanent results,—a work, not, perhaps, at once practical, but which, in the end, will prove to have furnished a treasure-house of valuable material, available at any time and for all time.

THERE is a general sentiment that a student can *finish* his education only by going abroad. In some departments of study this feeling prevails more largely than in others. It is especially prevalent in reference to linguistic and exegetical study. Is there not danger that this idea may be carried too far? Is it really true that our own country affords no adequate opportunities for advanced work in these lines? One must at once concede the many general advantages of a trip abroad. But aside from the general profit gained, how is it? Will the student find in Europe better *teachers* than in America? There are on the continent hundreds of renowned lecturers and authors; but do they *teach*? Germany is full of original investigators who are all the time bringing to light new and valuable material; but is not all this published? Foreign universities, it is true, have libraries with which even our best American libraries compare but poorly; but these libraries are for the use of men who have already become specialists, not for those who are merely beginning to prepare themselves for the work of specialists.

In the departments referred to, viz., the Semitic languages, and biblical exegesis, will not the embryonic specialist do well first to place himself in the hands of a Lyon, a Haupt, a Francis Brown, a Beecher, a Terry, or a Curtiss, and later, when he has exhausted the sources of supply in America, try a foreign university? The time has now gone by, if it ever existed, when a man *must* go abroad to study. The student can employ his time more profitably at home. Ample opportunities are offered him for work in every department. There will come a time in his life when a residence abroad will be of priceless value to him. This, however, will not be at the beginning of his work, but when, after having thoroughly grounded himself in the first stages of his subject, he is able to *stand alone*.

THE benefits of the Hebrew Summer Schools are indirect as well as direct. The direct benefits are received by those who engage in

these schools. But many who come into no contact with these schools, are also benefited by them. First, there has come about a remarkable change in the sentiment of students in theological seminaries. It is not more than ten years since in some of the foremost seminaries of the country it was thought no discredit for a man or for a class to fail in the Hebrew examination. To-day the sentiment is different. Again, some young men have been convinced of the importance of studying the Old Testament in the original, and have determined to attain some degree of proficiency in the language before entering a theological seminary. This persuasion, so far as due to the Hebrew Summer School, has been an indirect result. A direct result is that such men are enabled to accomplish their purpose. Another result has been the testimony called forth to the importance of the study. What stronger testimony could these men, both teachers and scholars, give to the importance of a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament than this laying aside the ordinary duties of life or the ordinary vacation pursuits and giving four weeks to Old Testament study? The Christian churches have been underestimating the importance of the Old Testament. If nothing more was done than to convince the churches that the Old Testament is worthy of earnest and devout study, the Hebrew Summer Schools will not have been in vain. Fourthly, such study has been kindled in regions which have received no direct impulse from these schools. Christian pastors are looking more and more into their English Old Testaments, they are taking down and dusting their Hebrew Bibles with a sigh that they did not have more favorable opportunities for the study of Hebrew in their earlier days; laymen are looking at their English Old Testaments with added respect, and occasionally determining to master the original, and even the Sunday-school scholar is beginning to feel that in the air is something new respecting the Old Testament. It would, of course, be unwarranted to attribute all these results to the Hebrew Summer Schools. The less conspicuous Correspondence School has had some share in the work. And besides, and above all this, in the ordering of God the Old Testament has come to the front in the theological world. The Hebrew Summer Schools, however, have had much to do in bringing the Old Testament to the front in this country; or to put the fact in another way, they have been a powerful instrument under God in the accomplishment of this work.

DIVISIONS OF THE DECALOGUE.

By TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York.

The Ten Commandments stand alone in the sacred volume. Originally pronounced by God himself from Sinai amid blackness and tempest and lightning-flashes, they were afterwards inscribed by his own hand on tables of stone, and when these were dashed in pieces by Moses, on a fitting occasion they were renewed by their divine author in the same way as before. Afterwards they were laid up in the ark of the covenant beneath the mercy-seat in the most holy place. Their internal excellence corresponds to this outward honor bestowed upon them. They are at the same time the oldest and the best code of human duty. They are so complete and comprehensive as to leave nothing to desire. And they are justly called by Ewald the granite substratum of the whole Bible.

The name by which the Decalogue is most distinctly mentioned in the Pentateuch is that of the ten words (Exod. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4). Hence arise two questions, not without interest to the serious student. What are these ten words precisely? i. e., where do they begin and end, and how are they discriminated one from another? and how were they distributed on the two tables which first received them?

I. WHAT ARE THE TEN WORDS?

To most Protestants of our day this question seems to answer itself. All who have been trained in any of the Reformed churches have been accustomed from infancy to see in their catechisms and in tablets on church walls one and the same series of commandments, each of which in all cases bears the same numerical designation; and it does not occur to them that there is any other way of viewing the matter. Yet in fact there are, and there have been almost from the beginning, diverse methods of making out the number ten.

1. *The Talmudic.* This is found in the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, or Pseudo-Jonathan, who lived in the fifth century of our era. It is contained also in the Talmud (*Makkoth*, xxiv. a). It was advocated by the learned Aben Ezra, in his *Commentary*, and by the still more learned Maimonides (*Sepher-Hammizroth*) and is now the common opinion of the Jews. According to it what is usually considered the preface to the whole, "I am Jehovah thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt" is made the first commandment, since these words, they say, imply the obligation to believe on God as the most perfect of all beings. Then they put verses 3-6 of the chapter into what they called the second command, including the recognition of God's unity and the prohibition of idol worship. The other eight precepts conform to the ordinary arrangement. It is somewhat remarkable that the chief peculiarity of this system—its use of the preface—is to be found in a treatise of Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) against Julian, in which he gives the second command as "Thou shalt have no strange gods beside me: thou shalt not make to thyself an idol." It was also maintained by the learned Peter Martyr in his *Loci Communes*. The obvious objections to this view are that verse 2 has in no respect or degree the form of a precept, and that it has

vastly more force when considered as a preliminary statement of a double import, first as giving the special ground for not accepting any other gods beside Jehovah, and secondly as furnishing the general presupposition of the law and the ground of its obligation, viz., the nature of God and his gracious dealing with men as their deliverer. Nor is there any reason for regarding verses 3-6 as one commandment. For they contain two points essentially distinct, viz., *whom* we are to worship, and *how* it is to be done. When Aaron made the golden calf at the foot of Sinai, and when Jeroboam instituted a similar bovine worship at Bethel and at Dan, the second command was violated but not the first, for it was Jehovah that was worshiped, though in a way that he abhorred. It was not until the great apostasy under Ahab and Jezebel that Jehovah was dethroned, and the object as well as the form of worship was overthrown by king and people running mad after Baal. Experience, therefore, as well as the nature of the case, shows that the verses following the preface contain two separate commandments which ought not to be confounded. It should be mentioned, however, that in the greater number of printed editions and manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible the commandments from the third to the tenth are separated by a *Pe* or a *Samech*, which are used to mark the smaller divisions of a passage, yet neither of these letters occurs in verses 2-6, which, of course, implies that these verses treat of but one subject. This fact, however, only shows how early the Jewish view of the matter originated.

2. *The Augustinian.* The great Latin father agreed with the Jews in confounding polytheism and idolatry, or as he said, "The command ('Thou shalt have no other gods but me') is more perfectly explained when images are forbidden to be worshiped." And he insisted that the prohibition of making or serving an idol was not a new precept, but simply an expansion or enforcement of the first injunction. But as he regarded the words, "I am the Lord thy God, etc.," as a preface, it was necessary in some way to make good the number ten. This he did by dividing the last command into two—one forbidding to covet our neighbor's wife, the other to covet his house, field, manservant, etc. (He follows the order given in Deut. v. 21.) He did this on the ground that the *cupido impurae voluptatis* is a distinct offense from the *cupido impuri lucri*. In this he was followed by Beda and by Peter Lombard, and the custom became common in the Latin communion. It was formally sanctioned by the Council of Trent and appears in their catechism, only that the division of the precept concerning coveting follows the order of Exodus and makes the ninth command to prohibit coveting our neighbor's house, and the tenth his wife and servant, etc. The same thing is done in Luther's Kleiner Catechismus. A peculiarity of this small catechism, which it shares with the small Tridentine catechism, has given rise to a very unjust aspersion on the Roman church. Both these catechisms give nearly all the commandments in a condensed or abridged form, and hence we read in both that the first command is, *Thou shalt have no other gods*, and the second is, *Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vain*. Hence the late Dr. Ashbel Green in his Lectures on the Shorter Catechism (II. 250) says, "You are aware that the Papists dispense with the second commandment, because it manifestly prohibits their use of images." So Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his admirable commentary on the Confession of Faith, says of the Romish church that she "unites the first and second commandments together in order to make it appear that only the worship of false gods and images of them are forbidden, while the images of the true God and of

saints are not excluded from the instruments of worship" (p. 342). But I think it is clear that both these statements are incorrect. (1) The blending of the first-command and the second into one was an old Jewish usage. (2) It was introduced into the Christian church by Augustine, certainly without any dogmatic aim. (3) The full text of both precepts is given in the larger symbols of the Roman church. (4) If the charge justly lies against the Romanists, it equally lies against the Lutherans, which is simply absurd. (5) An infelicitous abridgment of the Decalogue is not fairly regarded and treated as a designed and criminal mutilation of its substance. Rome has vulnerable points enough, and it is unwise to strike a blow where it can so easily be warded off. All that can justly be charged against the Romanists and Lutherans is not that they have mutilated the law of God, but that the form in which they state it in their shorter catechisms has the effect of concealing important parts of it from those who have access only to these catechisms. And while this is greatly to be regretted, it furnishes no ground for harsh and hostile criticisms, as if a deliberate purpose had been cherished to keep out of view integral portions of the great statute announced from Sinai.

That the tenth commandment cannot properly be divided seems to be self-evident. It is one and the same evil desire that is forbidden, however varied its objects. Augustine's distinction is wire-drawn and fallacious, for the *cupido* of the woman is condemned for precisely the same reason that the *cupido* of the house is, viz., because in each case that which is coveted belongs to another. A *cupido* which is wrong in its own nature is indeed condemned, but it is by another commandment. Besides, on two occasions Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans (VII. 7; XIII. 9), quotes this command, but in each case without an object attached, simply "Thou shalt not covet," which could hardly have been done, had he considered the command twofold.

3. *The Hellenistic.* This goes as far back as Josephus and Philo. The former (Ant. III. v. 5) says, "The first commandment teaches us that there is but one God, and that we ought to worship him only. The second commands us not to make the image of any living creature to worship it." And so he goes through the decade, ending with the words, "The tenth, that we must not admit of the desire of anything that is another's." The latter, in his treatise *De Decalogo*, makes substantially the same statement, following what appears to have been the received division of that day. Origen in his eighth Homily on Genesis notices the different views that were held on the subject, and says expressly that the words "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt" are not a part of the commandment. He also maintains that the first command is, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me," and the second, "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, etc.," and proceeds at some length to elaborate the distinction between them. And he urges that this distinction is necessary in order to maintain the number ten, showing that he knew nothing of the method of completing that number by dividing the prohibition of coveting into two parts. The same thing appears in a poem of Gregory Nazianzen (325-389) entitled *The Decalogue of Moses*, in which are found these lines.

These ten laws Moses formerly engraved on tables
Of stone; but do thou engrave them on thy heart.
Thou shalt not know another God, since worship belongs to me.
Thou shalt not make a vain statue, a lifeless image.

Thou shalt not call on the great God in vain.
 Keep all Sabbaths, the sublime and the shadowy.
 Happy he who renders to his parents due honor.
 Flee the crime of murder, and of a foreign
 Bed ; evil minded theft, and witness
 False, and the desire of another's, the seed of death.

In this he was followed by Jerome (345-420) who calls him his master, and who, in his commentary on Ephes. vi. 2, cites Exod. xx. 4-6, calling these words the second commandment. So Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* vi.) states the teaching of the second word to be that men ought not to confer the august power of God upon things created and vain which human artificers have made, among which "He that is" is not to be ranked.

This arrangement of the Decalogue, under the overshadowing influence of Augustine, appears to have been quite forgotten in the Western church, but was revived by Calvin in his *Institutes*, 1536. From him it spread into all the Reformed churches, and accordingly is found in the English Book of Common Prayer, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster standards. It seems always to have maintained itself in the Greek church, and is now found in the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern church, drawn up by Mogilas in 1643, and in the Longer Catechism of the same church, prepared by Philaret and adopted by the Most Holy Synod in 1839. There can hardly be a doubt that this is the correct statement of the Ten Words of Moses. It is simple, natural and complete. It makes no superfluous division, nor does it confound and blend what ought to be distinguished. It gives this wonderful summary of human duty in a way befitting its origin and its excellence.

II. WHAT IS THE PROPER DISTRIBUTION OF THE TEN WORDS ?

This is a question not so easily answered as the foregoing, inasmuch as there is really room for a wide difference of opinion. The fact that the Ten Words were originally written on two tables of stone suggested what indeed is apparent from the nature of the precepts themselves, that they were divided into two parts, one stating man's duty to God, the other his duty to his fellow men. This raised the question where the line should be drawn, to which three answers were given, one dividing the ten into three and seven, another into four and six, while a third made two pentads.

1. The plan of distributing them into *Three and Seven* was a conceit of Augustine's, after he had made the first two commandments into one. For thus bringing those that relate to piety into three, he said it was better to separate them from the remaining seven, "inasmuch as to persons who diligently look into the matter, those which appertain to God seem to insinuate the Trinity." Upon which Calvin appropriately says in his comment on Exodus xx. 12, "A frivolous reason is assigned by Augustine why they comprised the First Table in three commandments, viz., that believers might learn to worship God in the Trinity, and thus to adore God in three persons. By inconsiderately trifling with such subtleties men have exposed God's law to the mockeries of the ungodly." It is hard to believe that even to one person in a thousand a threefold division of the first table would suggest the thought of the Trinity, and still harder to believe that his faith in the doctrine would receive any increase of strength from such a suggestion.

2. The division into *Four and Six* was stoutly defended by Calvin, who insists that the first four precepts express the piety we owe to God and the last six the equity due to our neighbor. With him, therefore, the Second Table begins with the fifth command, "Honor thy father, etc." He refutes the course of those who would put this precept in the First Table as teaching a sort of natural piety, by appealing to the authority of our Lord who, he says, put an end to any dispute on the point, since in Matt. XIX. 19 he enumerates among the precepts of the Second Table this, that children should obey their parents. And to the objection made by some that the Apostle Paul, when in Rom. XIII. 9 he was giving the sum of the Second Table, omitted to mention the fifth commandment, he replies that this omission was designedly made because the whole context implied the precept, its express aim being to teach the authority due to kings and magistrates. In his commentary on Romans he gives the additional answer that the precept is included in the phrase, "And if there be any other commandment." His general ground of objection is that the course he opposes tends to confound the *religionis et caritatis distinctionem*, which, indeed, were it well founded, would be decisive; for the ultimate basis of all moral obligation is our duty to God, and if this be attenuated the sheet-anchor of ethics is gone.

Others sustain this division by an appeal to Ephes. VI. 2, where the fifth commandment is said to be "the first with promise," which it is said must mean the first in the Second Table, inasmuch as there is a promise attached to the second commandment. But the answer is obvious that the promise in the latter is of a general nature, having reference to the Decalogue as a whole, and stands in no particular relation to the precept which precedes it, so that really the fifth precept is *πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ*, first in point of promise. It has this character, whether it be joined to those that go before it or to those that follow after it. Others meet the argument by urging that the phrase should be rendered, not "the first commandment," but "a prime, i. e., a main precept in a promise." But this, although a possible rendering of the original, is not very natural, nor suited to the connection.

3. *Five and Five.* The earliest mention of this is in Josephus (Ant. III. v. 8) who says that Moses showed the people "the two tables with the commandments engraven upon them, five upon each table; and the writing was by the hand of God." With him agrees Philo, who divides the whole into two pentads. And so Irenæus (II. XXIV. 4), "Each table which Moses received from God contained five commandments." The basis of this distribution is thus given by Plumptree (Smith, Bible Dic. 3209), "Instead of duties toward God and duties toward our neighbors, we must think of the First Table as containing all that belonged to the *εὐσέβεια* of the Greeks, to the *pietas* of the Romans, duties, i. e., with no corresponding rights, while the second deals with duties which involve rights, and come therefore under the head of *justitia*. The duty of honoring, i. e., supporting, parents came under the former head. As soon as the son was capable of it and the parents required it, it was an absolute unconditional duty. His right to any maintenance from them had ceased. He owed them reverence as he owed it to his Father in heaven (Heb. XII. 9). He was to show piety (*εὐσεβείᾳ*) to them (1 Tim. v. 4). What made the 'Corban' casuistry of the scribes so specially evil was that it was in this way a sin against the piety of the First Table, not merely against the lower obligations of the second." To the same effect Oehler (Theol. of the Old Test., § 80) observes, "If in Leviticus (XIX. 32), 'Thou shalt

rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man and fear thy God,' and in Exodus (XXII. 27), 'Thou shalt not curse God, nor revile the ruler of thy people,' reverence to princes and to the aged is deduced from the honor due to God, the same thing must be still more true of honor to parents, since all authority of superiors is originally derived from that of the father." So Luther said (Expos. of the Decal., 1518). "Ideo istud praeceptum post praecepta primae tabulae, quia est de illis qui sunt vicarii Dei. Quare sicut Deus colendus est honore, ita et vicarius ejus."

We may then safely adopt this distribution of the Ten Words as the earliest and the best. It agrees with the definitive and rounded character of the series, and if the number *ten* were adopted, as seems reasonable, both from the completeness of that number and also because it would make it easy to remember by counting the precepts on the fingers, the most natural division of ten is into two equal parts, each embracing a like series of precepts, and each implying the other. Nor is the added gain small from the dignity thus given to the fifth commandment, which is the basis of all human society, and which, if obeyed, sheds its beneficent influence over every rank and condition, and proves an equal blessing to the church and to the state. To the child, so long as he is a child, the parent stands in the place of God, and by the steadfast usage of our own tongue filial obedience is filial piety.* The family has a religious as well as an ethical constitution, and the due performance of its duties is not merely indirectly, as in the Second Table, but directly and primarily, as in the First, an expression of homage to God over all.

* It is worthy of note that this phrase is peculiar. We never read of parental piety or fraternal piety. The term is applied only to what a child owes or performs to its parents as the representatives of God.

SHEKHAR AND LEAVEN IN MOSAIC OFFERINGS.

BY PRESIDENT ALVAH HOVEY, D. D.,

Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.

An argument for two kinds of *yayin* and two kinds of *shekhar* is drawn from the prohibition of *leaven* in offerings by fire unto the Lord. This prohibition is stated in Exod. XXXIV. 25: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven," and Lev. II. 11: "No meat offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall be made with leaven; for ye shall burn no leaven nor any honey in any offering of the Lord made by fire." But in Num. XXVIII. 7 it is written: "The drink offering thereof shall be the fourth part of an hin for the one lamb: in the holy place shalt thou pour out a drink offering of *shekhar* unto the Lord." Assuming that the process of *leavening* and of *fermentation* is effected by the same principle, that this fact was known to the sacred writers, and that this principle or cause was called by them *leaven*, it is inferred that there was in reality an unleavened and a leavened *yayin* and *shekhar*. Let us test the correctness of this assumption, and the soundness of this argument. To do this we propose the following queries:

1. Is the principle of vinous fermentation ever referred to in the Bible as *leaven*? If it is so named by the sacred writers, we ought to have the passages at command and be able to show it clearly. But if it is never so named, there is some reason to doubt whether the sacred writers knew that the cause of fermentation in wine was identical with leaven.

2. Is wine itself, under any of its names or forms, ever spoken of in the Scriptures as being either *leavened* or *unleavened*? Meal and dough and bread are thus characterized, but we do not know of any place where these terms are applied to wine or strong drink. Why this difference, if leavening and fermenting were known to be equivalent processes, one in solids and the other in liquids?

3. Is there any scriptural evidence that *wine* was removed from the houses of Israelites during the passover? The passover occurred at the beginning of harvest in the spring, before the new wine was ready for use—indeed months before. There must therefore have been old wine, and often an abundance of it, in Jewish houses at the passover—unless it was carefully removed. But we know of no evidence in the Bible, or in Josephus or Philo, that it was removed on account of that festival. But if it could be shown that wine was removed from Jewish houses at the passover, it would not follow that it was removed because it was unwholesome.

4. Is there any biblical evidence that *unleavened* bread was more wholesome or nutritious than *leavened* bread? If there is, let it be produced. We know of none. And, if we assume that the Mosaic legislation was intended to conserve the health of the people, we can hardly suppose that unleavened bread would be prescribed for a week only during the year, nor can we account for the gift of leavened bread to the priests as food (Lev. XXIII., 17-20). The fact certainly is that unleavened bread is harder and less wholesome than leavened. If leavening is fermentation, then fermentation improves the quality of certain substances for

the uses which they were intended to serve. But dietetic considerations were not supreme in the Mosaic ritual. Indeed, the only reason distinctly assigned by the Old Testament for the use of unleavened bread at the passover is thus stated (Deut. xvi. 3): "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it [the paschal lamb]; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life."

5. Is not Num. xxviii. 7 to be reconciled with Exod. xxxiv. 25 and Lev. ii. 11, by observing that *wine is never thought of or spoken of as leavened* by the sacred writers? Or, if we make a distinction between *yayin* and *shekhar*, is not the first passage to be reconciled with the others by observing that *shekhar* is never spoken of as *leavened*? This surely is the obvious way of bringing the different passages into accord, or rather, of seeing that there is no appearance of contradiction between them. "But if this method of explaining the passages be adopted, we lose the argument for two kinds of *yayin* and of *shekhar* which is derived from the prohibition of leaven in sacrifice." Undoubtedly; but our object is not to get arguments for total abstinence (*in which we believe*), but to interpret the Word of God faithfully.

What then is the proper meaning of *shekhar*? It is used twenty-three times in the Old Testament. *Twelve* times it is represented by *sikera* in the Septuagint (viz., in Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 32; xxviii. 7; Deut. xiv. 26; xxix. 6; Isa. v. 11, 22; xxiv. 9; xxviii. 72; xxix. 9). *Five* times it is translated *μέθυσμα* (viz., in Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. i. 15; Mic. ii. 11); *twice*, *μέθη* (viz., in Prov. xx. 1 and Isa. xxviii. 7); *once*, *οἶνος* (Ps. lxix. 13); and *three* times (Prov. xxxi. 4, 6; Isa. lvi. 12) it is not represented at all, because the Hebrew verses are not given in the Septuagint.

In the Latin Vulgate it is represented by *sicera* five times, by *ebrietas* eleven times, by *omne quod inebriare potest* four times, by *vinum* twice (Num. xxviii. 7; Ps. lxix. 13), and by *potio* once.

In the Revised English Version it is every-where translated strong drink, save in Ps. lxix. 13, where "drinkers of *shekhar*" are called simply "drunkards."

But a more detailed statement is needed. In Lev. x. 9 Aaron and his sons are forbidden to drink *yayin* or *shekhar* when going, or about to go, into the Tabernacle. In Num. vi. 3 the man or woman who takes a Nazarite's vow is forbidden to drink *yayin* or vinegar of *yayin*, *shekhar* or vinegar of *shekhar*. In Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14, the mother of Samson is forbidden to drink *yayin* or *shekhar*, or to eat any unclean thing, because her promised son was to be a Nazarite to God from the womb. In 1 Sam. i. 15, Hannah, when accused of intoxication by Eli, says: "I have drunk neither *yayin* nor *shekhar*, but I poured out my soul unto the Lord." In Ps. lxix. 12 it is written: "They that sit in the gate talk of me, and I am the song of drinkers of *shekhar*." In Prov. xx. 1: "*Yayin* is a mocker, *shekhar*, a brawler." In Prov. xxxi. 4, 6: "It is not for kings to drink *yayin*; nor for princes to say, Where is *shekhar*?" "Give *shekhar* unto him that is ready to perish, and *yayin* to the bitter in soul." In Isa. v. 11, 22: "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow *shekhar*; that tarry late into the night, till *yayin* inflame them." "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink *yayin*, and men of strength to mingle *shekhar*." In xxiv. 9: "They shall not drink *yayin* with a song; *shekhar* shall be bitter to them that drink it." In

XXVIII. 7: "These also have erred through *yayin*, and through *shekhar* have gone astray; the priest and the prophet have erred through *shekhar*, they are swallowed up of *yayin*, they are gone astray through *shekhar*." In XXIX. 9: "They are drunken, but not with *yayin*; they stagger, but not with *shekhar*." In LVI. 12: "Come ye, say they, I will fetch *yayin*, and we will fill ourselves with *shekhar*: and to-morrow shall be as this day." And in Mic.: "If a man, walking in wind and falsehood do lie, saying, I will prophesy unto thee of *yayin* and *shekhar*; he shall even be the prophet of this people."

In every one of these twenty cases the meaning *strong drink* suits the connection, and may be used in translating *shekhar*, without suggesting to any reader confusion of thought. In most of them an intoxicating drink is *supposed* by the context. The remaining three passages are as follows: In Num. XXVIII. 7, *shekhar* is specified as a daily drink offering to the Lord. Josephus says that this offering was of *wine*. The Latin Vulgate and the Authorized English Version translate *shekhar* "vinum" and "strong wine." In Deut. XIV. 26, it is said that a Jew going up to the sanctuary with a tithe of his cattle and grain in money, may "bestow his money, for whatsoever his soul desires, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *yayin*, or for *shekhar*, that he may eat there before the Lord, and rejoice with all his house." And in Deut. XXIX., 6, the Lord says to the children of Israel: "Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk *yayin* or *shekhar*: that ye might know that I am the Lord your God." In these instances *shekhar* seems to be looked upon as a common beverage, prized by the people, and not necessarily injurious. But until we know that stimulating drinks were regarded by the sacred writers as evil, and only evil, we cannot be sure that *shekhar* means in any of these passages an unfermented liquor. No particular kind of *shekhar* is pointed out. If there were two kinds in use, one fermented and the other unfermented, no hint is offered of this fact.

But there is another Hebrew noun from the same verbal root as *shekhar*, viz., *shikkāron* (ā as in father), which occurs twice in Ezekiel (viz., XXIII. 33 and XXXIX. 19). The former passage reads thus: "Thou shalt be filled with *shikkāron* and sorrow, with the cup of astonishment and desolation, with the cup of thy sister Samaria;" and the latter thus: "Ye shall eat fat till ye be full, and drink blood unto *shikkāron*" (RV., till ye be drunken).

An adjective *shikkor* from the same root is found thirteen times in the Old Testament (viz., in 1 Sam. I. 13; XXV. 36; 1 Kgs. XVI. 9; XX. 16; Job XII. 25; Ps. CVII. 27; Prov. XXVI. 9; Isa. XXIV. 20; XXVIII. 1, 3; Jer. XXIII. 9; Joel I. 5), and in every case is translated in the Septuagint, Vulgate and English Version by words signifying drunken, or drunkard. The adjective always means drunken.

The verb *shākar* occurs fifteen times; and in all but two of the places where it is used, it evidently means to drink to intoxication. The passages are Gen. IX. 21; Deut. XXXII. 42; 1 Sam. I. 14; 2 Sam. XI. 13; Cant. V. 1; Isa. XXIX. 9; XLIX. 26; LI. 21; LXIII. 6; Jer. XXV. 27; XLVIII. 26; LI. 7, 39, 57; Lam. IV. 21; Hab. II. 15; Hag. I. 6. In two of the passages (viz., Cant. V. 1 and Hag. I. 6) the verb may have a slightly weaker sense, viz., to drink to exhilaration. But the stronger and usual sense may be the one intended in these places, as well as in all the rest.

In view of the use of the verb, the adjective and the noun, we do not see how any impartial scholar can deny that the Revisers were right in translating *shekhar*

"strong drink" (i. e., drink that would intoxicate if taken in sufficient quantity) in Num. XXVIII. 7, as well as in all other places, except Ps. LXIX. 12, where "drinkers of *shekhar*" are called simply "drunkards." Perhaps it would have been better, for the sake of uniformity, to render literally "drinkers of strong drink" in this passage.

From Exod. XXIX. 40; Lev. XXIII. 13 and Josephus Ant. III. 4, it appears that a libation of wine (one-fourth of a hin) was daily offered to the Lord. Josephus appears to say that this drink offering was poured round the foot of the altar of burnt offerings. Many scholars suppose that it was poured on the altar or on the sacrificial animal lying on the altar, and especially because Exod. XXX. 9 forbids it to be poured on the altar of incense. If this libation of wine was identical with the libation of *shekhar* (which is almost certain), it follows that *shekhar* was a designation sometimes given to wine of a certain quality, that is, to "strong wine," and therefore the rendering of Num. XXVIII. 7 is substantially correct. Should any one still insist that the *yayin* employed in sacrifice was unfermented grape juice, it is pertinent to ask why it was not called *terosh* instead of *yayin*, since those who believe there were two kinds of wine then in use, namely, unfermented and fermented, insist that *terosh* always meant the former, while *yayin* often meant the latter? Why was not the law made unambiguous when this could have been so easily done? Surely the asserters of the two-wine theory ought to be surprised that the material of the daily drink offering was denominated *yayin* and *shekhar*, but never *terosh*.

Let us now return to the questions concerning *leaven*, and examine the statements of Scripture in relation to the use and effect of this substance. Two different words are translated "leaven" in the Old Testament, viz., *seor*, meaning by derivation to expand, to swell up, to ferment, spoken of dough, and *chamets*, meaning by derivation to be sharp, tart, sour. The former, however, is used as a noun, the latter as an adjective; the former signifies "leaven," the latter "leavened."

The former (*seor*) occurs in Exod. XII. 15, 19; XIII. 7; Lev. II. 11; Deut. XVI. 4, and in every instance is properly translated "leaven." The Septuagint version is ζύμη, the Vulgate, *fermentum* (once *fermentatum*). *Seor* is nowhere spoken of in connection with wine or strong drink or indeed any beverage. The material of it is supposed to have been commonly "sour dough."

The latter (*chamets*) occurs in Exod. XII. 15 (cf. 19, 20, *machmetseth*); XIII. 3, 7; XXIII. 18; XXXIV. 25; Lev. II. 11; VI. 10 (Eng. Vers. VI. 17); VII. 13; XXIII. 17; Amos IV. 5. The word means in every instance *leavened bread* or *dough*. It is an adjective, though often translated ζύμη in the Septuagint. It will repay us to look at every one of these texts with a view to accepting or rejecting the statement that *chamets* signifies *leavened bread* or *dough*, and not *leavened yayin* or *shekhar*. The first, Exod. XII. 15, reads: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven (*seor*) out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread (*chamets*) from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." Compare verses 19, 20: "Seven days shall be no leaven (*seor*) found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, that soul shall be cut off. . . . Ye shall eat nothing leavened: in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread." The second place is Exod. XIII. 3, 7: "There shall no leavened bread (*chamets*) be eaten." "Unleavened bread shall be eaten throughout the seven days; and there shall no leavened bread (*chamets*) be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven (*seor*) seen with thee."

The third is Exod. XXIII. 18: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with (or upon) *leavened bread* (*chamets*).¹" The fourth is Exod. XXXIV. 25, and is like the preceding. The fifth is Lev. II. 11: "No *meal offering*, which ye shall offer unto the Lord, shall be made with leaven (i. e., leavened bread, *chämets*): for ye shall bring no leaven (*scor*), nor any honey, as an offering by fire unto the Lord." The sixth is Lev. VI. 10 (Eng. Ver. VI. 17): "And that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons *eat*: it shall be eaten without leaven in a holy place: in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it. It shall not be baked with leaven" (i. e., leavened, *chamets*). The seventh is Lev. VII. 13: "With cakes of *leavened* bread he shall offer his oblation with the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving." This leavened bread appears to have been eaten by the priests (verse 16), though it was a part of the thank offering. The eighth is Lev. XXIII. 17: "Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth parts (of an ephah): they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven (i. e., *leavened*) for first fruits unto the Lord." The ninth is Amos IV. 5: "And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened (*mechämets*), and proclaim free-will offerings and publish them."

In all but three of these instances the reference to bread or meal is in some way expressed, and in three instances where it is not expressed there is *absolutely no reason* to suppose a reference to any thing different. Including the two passages where the participle is used instead of the adjective, there are eight cases in which bread or flour is in some way expressed, and three where it is not, but where it must certainly be understood.

If we compare the use of the verb *chamets* with the use of the noun and adjective, farther light will be gained. The verb occurs in Exod. XII. 34, 39: "And the people took their dough before *it was leavened*, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders" . . . "And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not *leavened*." In Ps. LXXIII. 21: "For my heart was embittered" or soured (rather than *grieved*), "and I was pricked in my reins." In Isa. LXIII. 1: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, crimsoned of garments from Bozrah?" The Greeks, says Gesenius, speak of a *χρῶμα ὀξύ*. In Hos. VII. 4: "They are all adulterers; they are as an oven heated by the baker; he ceaseth to stir (the fire), from the kneading of the dough until it be leavened." In Ps. VII. 4 the present participle *chomets* is translated *cruel man* (= acid, sour man).

From this root, finally, is the word *chomets*, translated "vinegar." It appears in Num. VI. 3; Ruth II. 14; Ps. LXIX. 22; Prov. X. 26; XXXV. 20. This word applies to liquids, but it is nowhere found in such connections as to imply that it was a pleasant beverage, used freely as a drink. It was neither exhilarating nor intoxicating, as used by the ancient Israelites. As drink it was bitter, sour, unpalatable, though it was sometimes used as a relish. Of the Nazarite it is said: "He shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink." Boaz says to Ruth: "Come hither, and eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar." The Psalmist puts these words into the mouth of the righteous sufferer: "They gave me also gall for my meat: and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." And there are two Proverbs, one: "As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that send him;" and the other: "As one that taketh off a garment in cold weather, (and as) vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart." Plainly

then this word is never used in the Holy Scriptures to denote any product of vinous fermentation.

But the Rev. J. M. Van Buren blames the translators and revisers of the English Bible for rendering *shekhar* in Num. xxviii. 7 "strong wine" or "strong drink." Though he lays down the rule, followed in this article, that "if a man makes a dictionary of the Bible, he has no authority but the Bible itself" (*The National Temperance Advocate*, March, 1886, p. 35), he makes what use he can of extra-biblical evidence. For in a previous number of *The National Temperance Advocate* (February, 1886, p. 19) he condemns the translators of the Common Version as follows: "The words 'strong wine' are only a fiction of the translators; they are not in the original Hebrew... Leaven is ferment, and ferment makes 'strong wine;' [and so] is forbidden. An awful responsibility, knowingly to quote this deception. We have a true and proper presentation of Num. xxviii. 7 in the Septuagint Greek of the Old Testament, made three hundred years before Christ, by learned Jewish scholars, while these offerings were made daily. They did not see 'strong wine' in the text. . . They simply transferred the Hebrew word *shekhar*, with a slight change for euphony, into *sikera*. If this was used instead of wine, the law required, as it did the wine, that it should be unfermented. Palm wine was *shekhar*; it is now and always has been used fresh."

In another passage he thus writes in respect to *sikera*: "This drink was derived from many sources. The juice of the palm-tree, or palm-wine, was, and still is, used fresh, in Eastern countries. *Sikera* was also expressed from various fruits; it was made from barley, from steeped raisins and dates. . . This *shekhar*, or *sikera*, made from barley, in its first, unfermented state, was what we now call *sweetwort*. It is a pleasant, nutritious drink; as malt, it is put up as a food for invalids. This liquid, when fermented, is intoxicating; and, with hops now added, makes beer. *Sikera of any kind was not released from the law*, which forbade 'leaven,' or ferment, in that which was poured upon the altar. A shocking imposition was practised when the Translators called this 'strong wine.'" (*National Temperance Advocate*, March, 1886, p. 35.)

Can any thing be more oracular or worthless than this? How does Mr. Van Buren know what the authors of the Septuagint Version understood by *sikera*? How does he know that palm-wine was called *shekhar*, or that *shekhar* or *sikera* "was made from barley, and was what is now called *sweetwort*?" Is the Bible his teacher in these things? According to a late edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary *sweetwort* is "any plant of a sweet taste." Any plant of a sweet taste is *sikera* then! And this is scholarship rebuking the translators and revisers of the English Bible! The cause of temperance deserves better advocacy than is found in these articles of *The National Temperance Advocate*.

ETHICAL VALUE OF PAGAN RELIGIONS.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

In treating the subject here proposed it is quite unnecessary to dwell, even by way of preliminary, upon the well-known character of pagan morality. That picture which, at a time when paganism was the dominant moral force in the world, when it was both at its best and at its worst, was sketched by a Christian apostle, stood then, as it stands to-day, unimpeached in its truth to the revolting original. Over against this, however, is found the remarkable fact that pagan teaching has always contained so much that commends itself to the Christian intelligence, approaching often, and sometimes even rivaling, at least in the estimation of many, the moral teaching of Christianity itself. Thus it comes to pass that we see in the ethics of paganism much of that same contrast between the moral theory and the moral practice which is found in nominal Christianity. It might, indeed, seem at first open to one who denies the superiority of Christianity among religions, to ask, Wherein, after all, are Christian nations, or is even Christianity as a moral system, really different at this point of view from pagan nations, or from paganism?

One might reply that when all in this direction has been admitted which the actual fact demands of us, still the practical morality of Christendom, when at its worst, is so much superior to that of paganism when at its best, that really no rational comparison can be instituted between them. It is under Christian, and not pagan, auspices that the life of the modern world has been molded and inspired. It is the Bible, and not any pagan philosophy, which has fixed those standards of morality in the light of which Christians themselves are so often called to account by worldly men, and which condemn them when they are found wanting. The Christian family, social Christian life, the Christian nationality, even where these are only nominally Christian, and have been shaped by Christian influence unconsciously to themselves—has there ever been a time when in any part of the pagan world these were even approached in moral excellence and efficiency for the promotion of human happiness; even when full account is taken of those faults which are incident to all things human?

The question, however, which underlies all matters of historical fact in these particulars, or of present experience and observation, is what we are here to deal with. What of good result in the particular now considered do we find *possible* to paganism, taking it at its best? We must in studying its history make those same allowances on the ground of the faults and failures of human nature upon which we insist when Christianity is in a like way brought to the test. After these allowances have been made, how does the case stand? Is pagan morality found, whether in its religion or in its philosophy, even capable of answering the moral ends of either philosophy or religion? It is at this point of view that we are to study it now.

What we have first to notice here is the fact that the ethical value of a religion or of a philosophy cannot be accurately estimated by its preceptive element. It is at this point, in very large measure, that paganism and Christianity are thought susceptible of comparison, the one with the other. And at this point such comparison may be allowed. Since Christianity covers the whole field of morals; since the wisdom of inspiration has anticipated the moral needs of our human nature at every point; and since, as is the fact, the Bible has a lesson, or a warning, or an encouragement, or a restraint for every moral exigency conceivable in the life of a human being—since this is so, the moral teachings of other religions, if there be any truth or any good in them, will show points of resemblance to the moral teachings of *this* religion. So far, then, as preceptive morality is concerned, let it be granted that, up to a certain limit, fixed by the fact that in its preceptive morality paganism covers only a small part of human life and action, and even within this narrow bound is often at fault in its own teachings—up to this limit let it be granted that comparisons may be made. The adequate and conclusive test of ethical value is, after all, not here.

There are three reasons why simply the preceptive part of a religion cannot be regarded as conclusive of its value, either as religion or as morality. One of these is that precept, like law in general, is of value chiefly as it is representative of what is deeper in the heart of things, and mightier in itself than precept alone can ever be. Precept, like law, may be “a dead letter.” It is always so, in fact, save as in the individual, the society, or the nation, there is a *conscience* which both endorses and enforces it. What effect did the philosophy of Plato have in staying the moral decline of the Greek people? or the philosophy of Cicero, or Seneca, in staying that of the Romans? What reason have we to suppose that the occasional high tone of moral precept in oriental religions ever really influenced the character or life of oriental nations? It is as when, in any country, laws are adopted far in advance of the reigning public sentiment or intelligence, so that they stand on the statute-book as representative of ideals, not of actualities.

Another reason to a like effect is that the value of precept, even where it is abstractly good, depends so much upon the motive. We may recall in this connection a precept, on its face much like one of Paul himself, which Prof. Mahaffy in his “Social life in Greece” quotes from “the gentle Menander,” as he calls him. “Prefer to be injured,” is a translation of the passage in Menander, “rather than to injure, for in so doing you will blame others, and you will escape censure.” Upon this Prof. Mahaffy comments by saying: “If he had not promised us the luxury of blaming others, the sentiment would have been thoroughly Christian.” What Paul says, apparently, but only apparently, to a like effect, is in one place in his epistle to the Romans, where mention is made of the coals of fire on an enemy’s head. If any one were to interpret this language of Paul in any sense of requital for injury done, or any selfishness of motive whatever, he would commit himself to the absurdity of either maintaining that the way to be revenged upon an enemy is to feed him when hungry and give him drink when thirsty; or to that of holding that when thus overcoming evil with good, as mentioned in the connection, one is in some way serving himself. In truth, that saying of Paul, which to a certain extent bears such a likeness to the passage in Me-

nander, enjoins a duty which in its motive puts self out of the account altogether, and looks alone to the good of even an enemy. For the "coals of fire" are neither more nor less than just that consciousness of being in the wrong, and shame and repentance on account of it, to which forbearance of this nature may often bring a man, and which are the best that even a man's warmest friends could wish for him when he either does or contemplates a wrong action. This case may illustrate the whole attitude of paganism on the one hand and Christianity on the other as respects the motive annexed to precept. The very highest motive to virtue which paganism anywhere proposes is the *advantage* of virtue. Does any one need to be reminded how infinitely inferior, at the point of view of ethical worth or value, this is to that motive which makes either *duty* or *charity* the law of life for a Christian man?

This leads to a notice of the third reason why the preceptive element alone is no test of the ethical value of either a religion, or of the morality it enjoins. Precept must be enforced by some adequate *sanction*, or there is very little of practical force to be expected in it. Behind law there is the authority which enjoins the law. The precepts of pagan philosophy, so far as they are good, are simply good advice—nothing more. So much of reverence as may be felt for the teacher, so much of sanction this good advice has; and this, as a moral force, is feeble at the strongest, and is even felt only by those who in some way are in more or less direct relation with the person of the teacher. If it be a precept in pagan religion, what value can it have when the gods whom this religion teaches men to adore are themselves incarnations, not of virtue, but of vice? When the God of the Christian says, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," there is an awful emphasis in the words that lends availing sanction to every precept of the religion which adores the great God as a holy being.

It is not, then, in the precepts of a religion that we are to find either its authority as a religion, or its ethical value as such. This element may exist in it simply in virtue of the fact that some great teacher has infused it here and there with right thoughts on fundamental themes; and it may exist there as practically inert or inoperative, so as to make it worthless to any real result in the interest of morality.

Closely related to the proposition sustained on these three several grounds is this other: That the inculcation of specific virtues, however just and true so far as it goes, does not of itself suffice in giving value to either a religion or a philosophy. We may take as an illustration the virtue of filial piety as enjoined in the teachings of Confucius. That filial piety, in the sense in which we commonly use the phrase, is eminently beautiful and eminently salutary in its influence on human character and in human life, no one can doubt. No religion enjoins it with stronger emphasis than does the religion of the Bible. There are even some things in the Chinese conception and use of it which appeal strongly to our human feeling in this regard. Something pleasing may be in the thought that at family festivals those who seem to be absent because dead are not so really, that places reserved for those who once were present are still filled, though with forms unseen; and there may be something pleasing, again, in the offering

of flowers and fruits set before the vacant seat, as if it were possible for these invisible guests to share in the entertainment. There may be something salutary in the belief that between the living and the dead there is only an apparent separation, and in the desire to so act on all occasions as that the dead parent may still approve the acts of the living child. But when all this grows into a worship, and becomes in the religion a feature so prominent as to characterize it, and to degrade its ritual into a tissue of trifling ceremonials, while the proper object of worship is left out of view, perhaps scarcely even known ;—when all this follows, the virtue of which so much is made in Chinese morality, and of which the Chinese sacred books have so much to say, becomes a delusion and a vice. The authorities tell us that Confucius, though he favored the practice of ancestral worship, finding it already in existence, as it had been for many centuries, was distrustful of its tendency. He tried to guard it by such teaching as that there could be no virtue in reverence for the dead while duties to the living were neglected or despised. But the result, in Chinese religion and Chinese morality, shows that simply the inculcation of a virtue does not suffice to make a people virtuous even in that which is thus enjoined. So with the virtue of temperance in all things, and self-control, which in oriental religions in a like way grows into the deformities of ascetic self-immolation. To all which may be added the general truth that while specific virtues are included in morality, yet morality, in any adequate meaning of the word, is virtue itself.

And this is very much the same thing as to say that what is the test of ethical value in any religion is the kind of *character* it tends to produce. We will say character in two respects, average character and ideal character. The second should be noticed first, since the ideal character in any religion must powerfully influence average character. To some extent the ideal of character in a religion may be seen in that which is attributed to the deity that is worshiped. It should seem that the conception any people may have of what is best in humanity may always be inferred from what is regarded as proper to deity. The mythology of a people, in fact, indicates its apprehension of what belongs to the highest being. The ideal of character is also seen in those whom pagan teaching and pagan literature set forth as ideal men. This is especially the case where the ideal man is the teacher himself, standing to his disciples in much the same relation, perhaps, as Jesus of Nazareth to those whom he taught. A conspicuous example is Buddha. Those who in these days and in enlightened lands so unaccountably show a tendency to accept the founder of the Buddhist faith as both an ideal teacher and an ideal man, must be strangely blinded. Let us take him just as the books picture him to us. The way in which he is represented as entering upon his career illustrates the fatal fallacy of his whole system. Does a man born to be the ruler of a people owe nothing to them? Is not his life-work provided for him in the very fact of being so born? Then Buddha had other ties; ties with wife and child; ties with the father and the mother whose only son and heir he was. Is it, after all, such a charming thing in him that he casts off all these and goes roaming over the world a barefooted beggar, preaching his gospel of *nirvana*? The story can be told in poetry so as to be very pleasing; but apply to it those tests which are afforded in the hard facts of human life and human duty, and what does it all become? The ideal Buddha affords in his own person is one which, if it were to be used in this world for other than poetical purposes, would take men

every-where out of their spheres of duty and service ; would make all manly virtues a crime ; would change the world's workers into puling, whimpering ascetics ; would make religion itself a mask for selfishness, and morality the carcass of a dead dog. Buddha's boast was, " I am no man's servant." Jesus said, " If any man would be great among you, let him be the servant of all."

How distrustful the best men among pagan teachers have shown themselves of the effect of such ideals as the pagan mythology affords, is well known. Plato, for example, " was of opinion," says Döllinger, " that in a well-ordered state the histories of the battles of the gods, of Hera's captivity, of the pushing of Hephestos down from heaven, should neither be admitted with allegorical explanation or without." He would have the mythology of his people " purged ;" but we may well ask, What would remain of that mythology, after, as he suggests, all that is undignified and morally hurtful had been purged away ? If this is true of a mythology which has been a chief inspiration in some of the noblest poetry the world has, in so far as transcendency of genius is concerned, how must the case have been with those worshiping deities supposed to take delight in human sacrifice, in the murder of infants, in debaucheries and cruelties such as we cannot even name ? How must it have been with those people along the Nile by whom the supreme object of worship was seen incarnated in a brute ? How must it be in pantheistic religions which rob the soul of all sense of a personal deity and leave morality and religion both to be the indigenous growth of man's own bad heart and bewildered mind ?

For the production and development of that kind of character which is ideally good, and which practically in the average man represents any just conception of human virtue, Christianity alone, of all historical religions whatsoever, makes any adequate provision. The strongest argument in support of the Christian doctrine of regeneration, apart from the divine authority upon which it is declared, is the absolute necessity of all which that doctrine imports to the ends of human virtue, and to the efficiency of any ethical teaching, however perfect in itself. The words of Jesus to Nicodemus, " Ye must be born again," have the indorsement of man's moral history from the beginning. This it is which the ethical systems of paganism, however in their preceptive features or in their inculcation of specific virtues they may have approached Christianity, have always fatally lacked. The answering query of the master in Israel, " How can these things be ?" does indeed still linger on the lips of the doubting or the disbelieving ; perhaps will do so to the end of time. All the same does the moral history of mankind make it certain that no ethical teaching, however complete in itself, ever transforms human life save as humanity is itself transformed.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

SEPT. 5. JESUS THE TRUE VINE. John XV. 1-16.

SEPT. 12. THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT. John XVI. 5-20.

SEPT. 19. JESUS INTERCEDING. John XVII.

In the first lesson, the imagery of verses 6 and 7 is very much like that of Ezek. XV. 4, 5.

The Old Testament citation in John XV. 25, though not in the Lesson, is worth studying, for several reasons. Undoubtedly it is from Ps. LXIX. 4 or Ps. XXXV. 19, in each of which places the Hebrew is a part of the subject, the word for hating being a participle used substantively (*shin'ay chinnam*), and is literally translated in the Septuagint *οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν*. Phrases of similar import are used in several other places in the Psalms. Jesus, in citing, makes a complete statement of the words which were, in the original, only the subject of a statement (*Ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν*). The instance would be important in an induction for defining what the New Testament writers mean when they speak of an Old Testament statement as "fulfilled." Jesus here intended to be understood that the world's hatred of him is just such a causeless and unjustifiable hatred as is often described in the Psalms; it is not so evident that he also intended to say that the acts of his personal enemies were specifically foreseen and foretold by the author of one or more of these Psalms.

In the third Lesson, in John XVII. 12, we again find the formula, "That the Scripture might be fulfilled." In this case, the formula is not attended by an actual citation; we are left to inference to determine whether our Savior refers to some particular passage, or to the general tenor of the Scriptures. Both views are actually held. The particular passages commonly claimed to be here intended are Ps. XLI. 10 (9), which is cited with reference to Judas in John XIII. 18; Ps. CIX. 8, cited in Acts I. 20; and Isa. LVII. 12, 13. Those who claim that the reference is to a class of passages would instance either those passages that are connected in the New Testament with the fate of Judas, or the wider class that refer to the betrayal and death of the Messiah. Yet another theory of the matter might be that when Jesus said, "None of them is destroyed except the son of destruction, that the Scripture might be fulfilled," he was referring to the doctrine of retribution currently taught in the Old Testament, and not to any specific predictions concerning himself or his immediate associates. As a specimen of this doctrine, see Ps. CIX. 16-19, in the Hebrew or the Revised Version. In this and a multitude of other Old Testament passages, the doctrine is emphasized that he who persists in playing the part of a "Son of Destruction" will justly be destroyed by Jehovah. Among these various views, one who insists that the fulfilling of Scripture here spoken of must be the coming to pass of a prediction should hold that the Scripture here said to be fulfilled is the whole line of prediction concerning the death of the Messiah; on any other theory, the fulfillment is simply the

fact that certain statements, made in the Old Testament, closely fit the case in hand, and may, therefore, be fairly applied to it.

The phrase "Son of Destruction," in xvii. 12, is a notable Hebraism. The fact that the citation in xv. 25 is from the "law" renders that verse one of the half dozen important instances for proving that, in the time of the writing of the New Testament, the term "the law" was currently applied to the whole Old Testament, as well as to the Pentateuch.

In the Lesson for Sept. 12, and throughout the chapters covered by the Lessons for the month, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is very prominent. This fact calls for the suggestion that the best way of studying the New Testament doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost would be to begin by studying the Old Testament doctrine. The study would be a surprise to many who are accustomed to think of the Old Testament as very barren in respect to this doctrine; it is, on the contrary, peculiarly rich here. Extending over the larger part of the ground which a Christian student would wish to cover, the two Testaments teach parallel doctrines concerning the Divine Spirit: and so far as they are parallel, the Old is very much more full and explicit than the New. Where they cease to be parallel, the New could best be studied by differentiating it from the Old. In making this study, one should, of course, avoid the carrying of New Testament ideas back into the Old Testament; and he should equally avoid the assuming that the New Testament ideas are not to be found in the Old, and the consequent straining of the language of the Old Testament, to prevent its teaching what the New Testament also teaches.

In John xvi. 20, and elsewhere in the chapters for the month, occurs the expression "verily, verily." No Bible student ought to need to be informed that the Greek word here is *ἀμὴν*, the same word with the "amen" at the end of the Lord's Prayer, and elsewhere. The word, of course, is Hebrew. We are accustomed to be told that it means, at the end of a petition, "so let it be." But a little study of Hebrew usage will give to the word a much richer meaning than this. Aaron and Hur stayed up the hands of Moses, and his hands were steady (*emunah*) till the going down of the sun (Exod. xvii. 12). This is a good instance by which to keep in mind the meaning of the Hebrew stem. It is applied to anything that is so well supported that it can be relied upon. From this radical idea come the Hebrew words for truth, and for believe. Verbally, in the Hebrew, truth is *that which can be relied upon*, and faith is our relying upon that which is reliable. Practically, the result is the same as that finally reached by all evangelical theology; but the path to this result through the Hebrew is direct, while that through latinized scholasticism is as circuitous as a horseshoe.

SEPT. 26. REVIEW.

OCT. 3. JESUS BETRAYED. John xviii. 1-14.

The fact that a Judas and a betrayal were necessary, that Jesus might be delivered into the hands of his enemies, is by itself conclusive proof that his death was not the work of the whole Jewish people, nor of the Palestinian Jews, as a body, nor of the constituted representatives of the nation acting in their proper capacity. On this account, Judas is a very interesting character to the lovers of the truth in Israelitish history. According to the narratives in the Gospels, a large majority of the men who held official position were among the enemies of

Jesus, and were determined upon his death. It is therefore the more significant that they dared not proceed against Jesus by public arrest and legal trial, but had to bargain with Jesus to get him privately into their hands. The actual proceedings against Judas will be considered in the lessons for the next month; for the present, we have to look at the fact that Jewish public opinion in regard to Jesus was, from the beginning to the end of his career, overwhelmingly and unswervingly in his favor. It is true that in John's Gospel the term "the Jews" is often used, without qualification, to denote those Jews who were hostile to Jesus. But this usage is peculiar to John, and is one of the marks of the relatively late origin of that Gospel. It is not found in the other Gospels, except, possibly, in Matt. xxviii. 15. It is occasionally found in the Acts and Epistles, but is frequent only in John. Among the New Testament writers, only John wrote after Christianity had become so completely differentiated from the rabbinical Judaism that Jew and Christian were habitually thought of as hostile to one another. The other gospels, with the Acts and the Epistles, habitually speak of the Jews as a people, some of whom openly accept Jesus, some of whom openly reject him, and some of whom do neither, but merely treat his claims with outward respect. When they wrote, this was still the prevalent condition of things; when John wrote, it had become a condition of things belonging to the past; it had already come to be generally considered that the Jews had one religion, and the Christians another; Christianity and Judaism were no longer regarded as two opposing movements in the Jewish religion.

But although John employs the term "the Jews" in this way, he certainly did not intend to be understood as saying that the Jewish people or nation hated Jesus and sought his life. In regard to this his statements agree with those of the rest of the New Testament. The Jews who sought the death of Jesus were a combination of public men, opposed one to another in many points, but agreeing in the fact that they all had reasons for wishing Jesus out of the way. Some of the traditional notions of us Christian people in this matter are very unjust to the Jews. In times when Christian nobles regarded the Jew as without the pale of common justice, and deemed it rare sport to persuade him, by means of the gridiron and the thumb-screw, to divide his wealth with them, it was natural to justify this by the theory that each particular Jew, in all time, is, in virtue of his being a Jew, one of the murderers of Jesus. Now that we have abandoned the Jew-compelling gridiron as infamous, it is time that we abandon this equally infamous misinterpretation of the New Testament.

The accounts of the history of Judea in the times of Christ, whether found in Josephus and the other original sources, or in the many secondary works that have been written, are confused and confusing. One should here be cautious how he illustrates Scripture by what purport to be historical facts, unless he has first tested the facts. Accounts of the scribes and pharisees and of the literature concerning them may be found in the larger Bible dictionaries and similar works, under the headings "Scribes," "Pharisees," "Mishna," "Talmud," and the like. Many of these accounts are quite full; they are usually rather unsatisfactory, perhaps necessarily so, on account of the nature of the subject. Edersheim's *Life of Christ*, published a year ago, and Shürer's *History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, just published, give to the general student advantages in this department of study, such as have never before been enjoyed.

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET.

BY PROF. EDWARD L. CURTIS, PH. D.,

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Hebrew word for prophet is *nabhi'* from *nabha'* to burst forth, bubble up like a fountain, kindred with *nabha'* to boil forth, gush out. This is the derivation given by Gesenius. It has been disputed whether the word is active or passive; whether it denotes one who bubbles forth the divine message or one who is made to bubble forth—one inspired. The weight of authority is now decidedly in favor of the active meaning. This, however, is a matter of small moment. Practically it must denote both, one moved upon, and one giving forth, a recipient and a revealer or proclaimer of the divine will; one to whom the *ne'um*, the secret confidential communication, of Jehovah was given and one who utters this forth. Abraham was the first called a prophet, Gen. xx. 7. "Restore this man to his wife," said the Lord to Abimelech, "for he is a prophet." Abraham was one to whom the Lord revealed his will. Gen. xviii. 17. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" He received also the divine promises and must have communicated them to his household. The next use, however, of this term in the Old Testament settles more precisely its meaning and presents the active force of the word. In Exod. vii. 1, God says to Moses, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." But in Exod. iv. 16 it had been said, "And he [Aaron] shall be thy spokesman unto the people, and it shall come to pass that he shall be to thee a mouth and thou shalt be to him as God." Hence a prophet is the mouth-piece of God, the speaker of God, "the organ through which the Invisible One speaks audibly to his people." And the word *nabhi'* is probably best to be connected directly with the Assyrian *nabû* "to speak, say, name, appoint," which appears in the name of the Assyrio-Babylonian god Nebo, the speaker or Mercury of the gods, who carried their messages to men. Moses was thus pre-eminently a prophet, Num. xii. 6 seq.; Deut. xvii. 15; Hos. xii. 13. Moses and Christ were the greatest of the prophets. In a strictly biblical and Old Testament sense is Christ called "Our Prophet."

But if the prophet is a revealer or speaker of the divine will, how does he differ from the other writers of Scripture? The prophet gave the divine will or message as something apart and distinct from his own thoughts. He differs thus from the sacred poet. "The poet gave utterance to the longings, aspirations, fears, doubts and anxieties of man's heart, whereas the prophet was commissioned to address himself directly to the people as conveying to them the message of God. One represented so to speak the human side of the truth, what man feels and is; the other, the divine, what God is and requires. One speaks from man to God, the other, from God to man." In like manner, also, does the prophet differ from the writer of the wisdom literature. That is divine truth, but it is truth obtained by a process of reflection and study. "And I applied my heart," says the writer of Ecclesiastes (i. 13), "to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all that is done under heaven." "I communed with my own heart" (i. 16). Within the same class come also the sacred historians, who received their information from

living witnesses and written documents or oral tradition, but to whom generally we cannot infer that aught of historical knowledge was revealed. Their method of procedure, judging from their frequent references to authorities, was not unlike that of Luke, who says, "It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus." (Luk. i. 3). The matter of these writers we regard inspired, but not revealed. The prophet, on the other hand, received truth by revelation. His natural faculties of reflection, reason, and imagination were doubtless not abated, nay rather were quickened, yet he was conscious of receiving information in some other way than through these. It was not the result of his own efforts, instruction or intention, not the product of his own thinking, but was a divine communication. A power outside and apart from himself gave it unto him: a power compelling him to speak. Hence the hand of the Lord was said to be upon him. Isa. viii. 11; Jer. xv. 17; Ezek. i. 3; iii. 14, 22; viii. 1. Hence his message is repeatedly called the word of the Lord, a "thus saith the Lord," as commences nearly every paragraph of the prophetic writings. The prophets distinguished themselves from the false prophets because the latter spoke a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord (Jer. xxiii. 16). False prophets spoke according to their own wishes and desires, spoke to flatter and please their hearers. Not so did the true prophets. They spoke even against their own inclination (Jer. xx. 9). This distinct consciousness of uttering the word of God, is one of the strongest arguments for the truth of their claim to be the revealers of the divine will, just as one of the strongest arguments for the messiahship and divinity of Christ is his own consciousness and testimony of the same. As in the case of the greatest of the prophets, so also of his forerunners, they were either deceivers, or self-deceived, or, as they claimed to be, the mouth-pieces of God.

UNROLLING THE MUMMY OF RAMESES THE GREAT.

[From a translation (in *Sunday School Times* of Aug. 14, 1886) of Prof. Maspero's Official Report.]

The mummy (No. 5,233) [discovered in 1881 in the tomb of the priest-kings at Dayr-el-Bahari] first taken out from its glass case is that of Rameses II., Sesostris [the first Pharaoh of the oppression, according to the view of many eminent scholars], as testified by the official entries bearing date the sixth and sixteenth years of the reign of the high-priest Her-hor Se-Amen, and the high-priest Pinotem I., written in black ink upon the lid of the wooden mummy-case, and the further entry of the sixteenth year of the high-priest Pinotem I., written upon the outer winding-sheet of the mummy, over the region of the breast. The presence of this last inscription having been verified by His Highness the khedive, and by the illustrious personages there assembled, the first wrapping was removed, and there were successively discovered a band of stuff (*sic*) twenty centimetres in width rolled round the body; then a second winding-sheet, sewn up and kept in place by narrow bands placed at some distance apart; then two thicknesses of small bandages; and then a piece of fine linen reaching from the head to the feet. A figure representing the Goddess Nut, one metre in length, is drawn upon this piece of linen, in red and white, as prescribed by the ritual. The profile of the

goddess is unmistakably designed after the pure and delicate profile of Seti I., as he is known to us in the bas-relief sculptures of Thebes and Abydos. Under this amulet there was found another bandage; then a layer of pieces of linen folded in squares and spotted with the bituminous matter used by the embalmers. This last covering removed, Rameses II. appeared. The head is long, and small in proportion to the body. The top of the skull is quite bare. On the temples there are a few sparse hairs, but at the poll the hair is quite thick, forming smooth, straight locks about five centimetres in length. White at the time of death, they have been dyed a light yellow by the spices used in embalment. The forehead is low and narrow; the brow-ridge prominent; the eyebrows are thick and white; the eyes are small and close together; the nose is long, thin, hooked like the noses of the Bourbons, and slightly crushed at the tip by the pressure of the bandages. The temples are sunken; the cheek-bones very prominent; the ears round, standing far out from the head, and pierced like those of a woman for the wearing of earrings. The jaw-bone is massive and strong; the chin very prominent; the mouth small but thick lipped, and full of some kind of black paste. This paste being partly cut away with the scissors, disclosed some much worn and very brittle teeth, which, moreover, are white and well preserved. The moustache and beard are thin. They seem to have been kept shaven during life, but were probably allowed to grow during the king's last illness; or they may have grown after death. The hairs are white, like those of the head and eyebrows, but are harsh and bristly, and from two to three millimetres in length. The skin is of earthy brown spotted with black. Finally, it may be said that the face of the mummy gives a fair idea of the face of the living king. The expression is unintellectual, perhaps slightly animal; but even under the somewhat grotesque disguise of mummification, there is plainly to be seen an air of sovereign majesty, of resolve, and of pride. The rest of the body is as well preserved as the head; but in consequence of the reduction of the tissues its external aspect is less life-like. The neck is no thicker than the vertebral column. The chest is broad; the shoulders are square; the arms are crossed upon the breast; the hands are small and dyed with henna; and the wound in the left side through which the embalmers extracted the viscera, is large and open. The legs and thighs are fleshless; the feet are long, slender, somewhat flat-soled, and dyed, like the hands, with henna. The corpse is that of an old man, but of a vigorous and robust old man. We know, indeed, that Rameses II. reigned for sixty-seven years, and that he must have been nearly one hundred years old when he died.

➤BOOK † NOTICES.◀

ORELLI'S OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.*

We notice first the scope of this work. In the Introduction biblical prophecy is defined and clearly distinguished from analogous heathen phenomena; its subject-matter, the kingdom of God, is stated; the influence of the age upon it is shown and limited; the office of the type is set forth, and the notion of fulfillment, in general and in the new covenant, is given. Thus we have here enough to enable one to comprehend fully the phenomena of biblical prophecy. In the main work there is traced in its historical development the heralding word of God's kingdom in all its phases through the entire Old Testament. This is not merely done by giving this in outline as a general scheme found running through the Old Testament, but by a critical translation and exegesis of the leading Messianic passages. Notes also contain introductions to the prophetic books. Thus the extent of the subject-matter of this single volume may be compared with that of Hengstenberg's *Christology of the Old Testament*, in four volumes.

We notice next the spirit and view-point of this work. Prof. Orelli is a conservative Christian scholar, a thorough believer in the supernatural and the divine element in prophecy, and yet he is not hide-bound in his conservatism or a blind follower of tradition. He belongs to the modern school of historico-biblical critics, and uses their methods. Noticeable is his comment on the blessing of Noah, p. 103. "The question from whom such an oracle sprang or received its present form is one of extraordinary difficulty. It is clear from the above interpretation how great was the influence of the Hebrew language on the form of Noah's blessing, and of course the Hebrew language was just as little spoken by the patriarchs as by Adam in Paradise. In its contents also the oracle is conditioned by the revelation given to the people of Israel after Moses. Compare the emphatic use of the name of Javeh and the description of Canaan as cursed by the progenitor. On the other hand, it is out of harmony both with the spirit of antiquity and in particular with the moral earnestness of the biblical authors to invent such oracles of set purpose and publish them as words of an ancestor. Rather in this old Hebrew oracle we have to deal with a primitive tradition, the kernel of which reaches back beyond the Hebrew nationality, but which received its present form from the spirit of the Israelitish theocracy (as in the account of creation). The greatness of its contents makes it certain that it was a prophetically deep and far-seeing seer who put down Noah's word as the Alpha of the world's history. Such a saying can not be explained as a limited reflection of the view of a particular time, or as the product of certain political relations and moods."

* THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY OF THE CONSUMMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD, traced in its Historical Development. By C. Von Orelli, Professor of Theology, Basel, Switzerland. Translated by Rev. J. S. Banks, Headingley College, Leeds. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. 1885. Pp. viii, 472.

ISA. XL.-LXVI. is assigned to another than Isaiah. Zechariah is regarded the work of more than one writer. Yet the views of this work as a whole are those of our orthodox conservative scholars, and so completely is it pervaded with an earnest, reverent, candid tone that it cannot but prove acceptable and stimulating to Bible-loving and evangelical students, whatever their critical views. As regards all the interpretation of prophecy Prof. Orelli is sober and sound. He is not an extreme literalist, nor does he unduly spiritualize prophecy. He follows the rule which he gives respecting the relation of prophecy to fulfillment: *A prophecy can only be regarded as fulfilled when the whole body of truth included in it has attained living realization.*

For a German theological writer his style is unusually clear. No one in reading this book is liable to be lost in a fog. Hence for a comprehensive, clear, sound view of Messianic prophecy we highly commend this work. We know of no better.

SCRIPTURES HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN.*

How shall we introduce young people or others to the study of the Bible? Shall we present them the book as a whole, either with or without comment? Or shall we by judicious selection give them the salient contents of the book, arranging together history, prophecy, law, proverb and song, so that their matter will not only be known, but their mutual relations will be seen at once? Drs. Bartlett and Peters have adopted this latter method—and the principle is a true one: as far as possible let Scripture be its own introduction—and have given a volume admirably suited for this purpose. There is no note or comment, only condensation and re-arrangement. A book has been furnished to which a young reader will often more readily turn on a Sunday afternoon for instruction or entertainment, than to the ordinary Bible, because the selections present nothing dull, nothing obscure, and nothing irrelevant to the topics chosen. Phrases unintelligible, unchaste and unnecessary have been omitted. At the same time there has been scholarly fidelity to the original and a preservation for the most part of the wording of the Authorized or Revised English Version, so that none of its classic beauty has been lost. The minor changes made have been mainly in the direction of simplifying passages or idioms unintelligible to the average reader. Explanatory glosses have, of course, been at times introduced, but these when of more than one or two words are indicated. The mechanical execution of the work is very attractive.

While thus heartily commending this work as adapted to the end in view, and prepared to serve as an open door for a further study and knowledge of the Bible, notice must be taken of the fact that the reading of the book will tend to fit one to receive the results of modern criticism. This is owing to the frequent and at

* SCRIPTURES HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN. Arranged and Edited for Young Readers as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible, by Edward T. Bartlett, A. M., Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, and John P. Peters, Ph. D., Professor of the Old Testament Languages and Literature in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia. Vol. I. Hebrew Story from Creation to the Exile, comprising material from the following Books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1886. Pp. xii, 545.

times striking agreement between the editors' arrangement of the Bible story and that of modern critics. The Hebrew law, for example, is to be placed in the second volume, which will deal with Jewish history from the Captivity to the time of Christ. Nothing from Leviticus appears in the first volume. The editors, however, disclaim any intention thus to favor the reception of modern critical views. They state that, "when they observed the agreement between their practical division, and the division of the critics, they were as much surprised as any of their readers can be. We do not wish to be understood as disclaiming critical views, but we are not conscious of having made this work a vehicle for the expression of those views." (Pref. pp. iii, iv.)

EIGHT STUDIES OF THE LORD'S DAY.*

The eight studies of this book are: "The Phenomena of the Day." "The Week." "The Primeval Sacred Day." "The Mosaic Sabbath." "The Sabbatic System of Israel." "The Permanent and the Transient in the Sabbatic System." and "The Fourth Commandment." Their object is to set the admitted facts connected with the Lord's Day in a proper light; to show that the whole Bible does provide and prophesy this day now kept by Christians. They are addressed to believers and based upon the principles, first, that "The conduct of Christians must be guided solely by the Word of God, intelligently examined, not merely as to isolated passages long or short, but also as to its teaching as a continuous developing and integral revelation;" and second, that "Christian consciousness through the ages has been at heart always right." This is a work of more than ordinary merit, having the charm of dealing with facts, those of secular and Christian life and of the Bible, and of confining itself to these. Hence it is not a dogmatic treatise, nor made up of practical homilies, nor of polemic arguments, but, as its modest title declares, of studies, scientific in method, fresh and vigorous in thought, and replete with stimulating suggestion. It is a real contribution to the literature of its subject. The most striking study of all, perhaps, is that of The Week which thus closes: "The week has been, through the ages, as now, the sign of a relation between God and man. It is a witness, not—like months and years—to the material, but to the spiritual. It tells not of sun, moon, and stars, which are seen, but of a Spirit unseen. It exists, not in accordance with conditions and circumstances inherent in nature, but by the arbitrament of a Supreme Will, communicated to loyal dependents. It is fitted for human use, kept in its regular unvarying succession before human notice, and maintained as the assurance of divine regard for man, by the institution of a sacred day which marks its boundary and illuminates the transition from one week to the next. The emphasis, then, of the fivefold Gospel statement is on this circumstance, that our Lord's resurrection day is the boundary, the defining day of a new week—identical with the old, yet transfigured in this new morning light. So then all the significance of that day, which seals to man his one great all-comprehending divinely centred hope, is blended with the significance of that period which, through the ages, has assured a bond between God and man,—when the transcendent day of days is described as the first day of the week."

* EIGHT STUDIES OF THE LORD'S DAY. Cambridge: *The Riverside Press*. Printed for Private Distribution. 1884. (Copyright, 1884, by *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*)

A MANUAL ON OLD TESTAMENT BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.*

This is the second volume in what promises to be a very useful series of manual text-books for theological classes and students. The first volume was published fifteen months ago as a "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology, based on Hagenbach and Krauth. Part I. Exegetical Theology." It met with a welcome reception not only in America but also in Germany and other European circles. The object of the series is to take the leading works of conservative authors on the various theological disciplines, and by a careful and critical condensation to make them suitable text-books for theological students. For the Old Testament field no better work could have been chosen than that of the departed Oehler, acknowledged the *facile princeps* in this department among the better class of German theologians. The only question in connection with Prof. Weidner's work is whether the condensation can be pronounced satisfactory. We consider it well done. His style is clear and to the point, and he everywhere seems to have reproduced the gist and marrow of the original. Reproducing another's work in substance is not an easy task, and Professor Weidner is for that very reason entitled to special recognition.

One or two suggestions, however, present themselves to the reader. The bibliography of the subject added by Professor Weidner is good as far as it goes, although occasionally slips will occur, as, e. g., forgetting to mention on page 10 that the second edition of Shürer has appeared in a much enlarged form in both German and English, and failing to mention on page 215 the work of Bissell on the Pentateuch. And aside from this, we think that in a bibliography intended for students, something more should be given than merely the title, place and date of publication. In a few words the size, character and importance of the books could have been added, as has been done in the case of a few. The theological discussions in Old Testament Theology since the death of Oehler are almost entirely ignored. These discussions have not been an unmixed evil. They have brought forth some good gold for the benefit of positive Christian science. And, besides, a resumé, no matter how briefly outlined, would have helped the student to understand the burning questions of the day in the department to which this book introduces him. Still, we heartily recommend this work of Professor Weidner.

* BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, based on Oehler. By Reverend Franklin Weidner, Professor of Theology in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. Philadelphia: H. B. Garner, 710 Arch Street, 1886. 8vo, pp. xiii, 222.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Evolution of a Shadow; or, the Bible doctrine of Rest.* By A. M. Weston. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co. Cl., pp. vii. 292.....\$1.50
- The Jewish Altar.* By the late John Leighton. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Cl., 12mo. pp. iii. 127.....75c.
- Bible and Belief, a letter to a Friend.* By Rev. W. Humphrey. London. 12mo.....\$1.25
- Eternity. What does the Bible say of it? A concordance.* Willard Tract Society.....70c.
- Haman and Mordecai; a drama in five acts.* By Clifton Harby. Cincinnati: The Bloch Pub. and Printing Co. 16mo. pap.....25
- Theologie de l'Ancien Testament.* By Ch. Piep- enbring. Paris: Fischbacher. 8vo.....7 fr. 50
- Beitrage zur Geographie Palaestinas.* By H. Hildesheimer. Berlin: Rosenstein.....M.4
- Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bod- leian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford.* Compiled by Ad. Neubauer. Lon- don: Clarendon Press. Catalogue £3 13s. 6d.; the Facsimiles.....£2 12s. 6d.
- Sculpture, Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman.* Containing a Chronological List of Ancient Sculptors and their Works. By George Red- ford. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. Crown 8vo.....5s.
- The Apocalypse in Evolution and the Book of Daniel in its First Interpretation.* Utien, N. Y.: Arthur Urie. Pp. 72.
- Biblia Hebræotla.* Edited by Edward Riches de Levante. London: R. D. Dickinson. Half French Morocco. Six vols.....\$22.00
- Bible Readings.* Arranged by Susan L. Hatch. Boston: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 16mo, pp. 72.....40c.
- The Six Days of Creation; the Fall; and the Deluge.* By J. E. Reimensnyder. Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc. 12mo, pp. 368.....\$1.25
- A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.* Second Division. Vol. III. By Emil Schuerer. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford. Pp. 381.
- Anglo-Israelism not necessary to the fulfilment of Scripture promises.* By Jasper Wilson. Tor- onto, Canada: W. Briggs. Pp. 24.....10c.
- The Churchman's Family Bible.* With Com- munity by various authors. Part XIV., Ezekiel to Micah; Part XV., Micah to Esdras; Part XVI., Esdras to Wisdom of Solomon. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 4to.....each part 6s.
- Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel.* By W. A. Crocker. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Meth- odist Publishing House. Pp. 104.
- Bible Use of Illustration.* An Address by Chas. M. Hobbs before the Sixth Annual Con- vention of the Colorado Sunday-school Asso- ciation. Denver: Tribune-Republican Print. 18mo, pp. 32.
- History of the Bible.* By Albert Colby. East Conway, N. H.: Published by the author. 12mo, pp. 132. Revised ed.....50c.
- Moses—the Man and the Statesman.* By Isaac M. Wise.....25c.
- Biblical Essays.* By C. H. A. Wright. New York: Scribner & Welford. 12mo.....\$2.00
- Days of Messiah's Glory; or, Christ in the Old Testament.* By D. Baron. London: Hodder. 8vo, pp. 270.....6s.
- Die Stellung Ezechiels in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie.* By Th. Arndt. Berlin: Hauck. 8vo, pp. 32.....M.1.20

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- The Mummy of Sesostris.* By G. Maspero in Academy, July 3, '86.
- The Royal Mummies at Boulak.* Ib., ib., July 31, '86.
- The Royal Mummies at the Boulak Museum.* Ib., July 24, '86.
- The French Excavations in Susiana.* Ib.
- German Translations of the Bible before Luther.* By Karl Pearson, ib., Aug. 7, '86.
- Hosmer's "The Jews."* By P. A. Barnett, ib., July 10, '86.
- Revision of the Bible.* By G. Vance Smith in Nineteenth Century, July, '86.
- Note on Genesis and Science.* By W. E. Glad- stone, ib., August, '86.
- The Study of the Old Testament.* By Joseph T. Duryea in Church Union, June 15, '86.
- Does it Pay to Study Hebrew?* By J. W. Payne in Pulpit Treasury, June, '86.
- The Light of Holy Scripture.* Positive Aspect. By E. V. Gerhart in Reformed Quarterly Re- view, July, '86.
- The Ancient Oracle.* By H. P. Laird, ib.
- The Prophets.* By S. Calthrop in Unitarian Review, July, '86.
- On Maccabean Psalms.* By C. H. Toy, ib.
- The Eternal's Secret with the Prophets.* By N. P. Gilman, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Revision of Genesis.* By Charles R. Brown in Bibliotheca Sacra, July, '86.
- The Revised Version of the Old Testament.* By Samuel Ives Curtiss, ib.
- The Book of Jubilees.* (Chapters XII.-XXIV.) Translated from the Ethiopic by Geo. H. Schodde, ib.
- The Vision of Ezra the Scribe concerning the latter times of the Ishmaelites.* By Isaac H. Hall in Presbyterian Rev., July, '86.
- The Revision of the English Old Testament.* No. IV. By G. C. M. Douglas in Monthly Interpreter, Aug., '86.
- Biblical Topography.* VI. Sites connected with the History of Abraham—Haran, Damascus, Hebron. By G. Rawlinson, ib.
- The Argument of the Book of Job.* By David Shanks, ib.
- The Patriarchal Times.* IX. The Tower of Babel. By Thomas Whitelaw, ib.
- The Revised Version of the Old Testament.* The First Book of Kings. By A. F. Kirkpatrick in Expositor, July, '86.
- Brevia.* Job vi. 25; Ps. CXXIII. 2. By T. K. Cheyne, ib.
- Dancing and Pentateuch Criticism in Correla- tion.* By Franz Delitzsch, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Revised Version.* The Second Book of Kings—Nehemiah. By A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Book of Zechariah.* 4. The Flying Roll and the Ephub. By Marcus Dods, ib., Aug. '86.
- The Gospel Given to Abraham.* By Joseph Angus, in Sunday-school Times, June 5, '86.
- Shool, Hades, or the Intermediate State.* By A. A. Hodge, ib., July 3, '86.
- A Critical Reconstruction of the Religion and History of Israel.* Ib., August 7, '86.
- Biblical Inspiration; or, Inspiration as a fact related to Scripture.* By Ransom B. Welch in Independent, July 29, Aug. 12, '86.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

OCTOBER, 1886.

NO. 2.

THE practical has charms for everybody. We reproduce in this number from *The Independent* (Sept. 9th) a short article by the Rev. Henry W. Hulbert. It deserves a careful reading. Why should not many men do this very thing,—see *Palestine*? What a help, what an inspiration; and while all cannot avail themselves of such a privilege, there are many for whom it would be entirely possible. A year in Syria and Palestine would benefit the prospective minister more than two years in Germany. Is it not worth thinking of?

LIKE the preaching of our day, there is much teaching which may be termed, by way of criticism, intellectual. When this criticism is made of preaching, every one understands it. The preaching so described is from the head and not from the heart. There are brains in it, but no soul. Such preaching is, perhaps, adapted to the wants of many, but to the needs of few. Some, doubtless, are satisfied with it; but generally this is so because they really have no conception of any other kind. The case is precisely the same in the work of teaching. In the larger institutions it is prevailingly intellectual. The teacher is learned. The student must accomplish the task assigned. There is no question which the teacher cannot answer. There is no phase of the subject which he has not studied. The student, under compulsion, is regular in attendance and passes creditable examinations. Yet there is something lacking. There is no sympathy between pupil and instructor; there is no constantly deepening interest in the work. The labor of both is perfunctory. There is, in fact, no soul in it. There is a world of difference between that lecture-room in which "lessons are heard," and that one in which "lessons are taught." The teacher should be not merely an examiner, but also an instructor.

This criticism holds good alike of much work done in the divinity school, the college, the high school and the Sunday-school. Many pupils study for years and are never *taught*. There are many *head-teachers*, but few *heart-teachers*.

TO STUDY the Bible devotionally is, next to prayer, the highest privilege and the highest duty of the Christian. Communion with God's word is second, but only second to communion with God himself. Is there in our day too much devotional study of the Bible? An equally appropriate question would be, Is there too much prayer? In the very nature of the case, there cannot be too much of that which, from the stand-point of Christian truth, of all things the world needs most. There is, however, a serious danger here. It is true that the devotional study of the Bible is the highest kind of Bible-study. Its successful accomplishment requires the greatest of all gifts—the aid of the Holy Spirit. But there are other kinds of Bible-study which those most devoted to Bible-truth are sometimes apt to neglect; for it is strange how, even in such a matter as this, the tendency is to one extreme or another. Just as, in so many instances, those most learned in the linguistic, historical and literary aspects of the Bible, depreciate the devotional element; so those who have gone deepest into the great spiritual mysteries of the divine truth, too frequently regard with little interest the literary and historical setting of that truth. The fact that so many specialists have not had a practical experience of the saving truth which the Bible proclaims easily explains why they have no particular interest in its devotional study. But how shall we explain the other tendency? Inasmuch as so much depends upon the exact force of a word, or the precise historical relation of an event, or the time and circumstances of a writing, one would suppose that no effort would seem too great, which might even in the slightest way throw light upon the truths of Scripture. But the student who emphasizes the devotional study too often treats all other kinds of Bible-study as of little value, if not, indeed, hurtful. Not many, to be sure, would openly confess such an attitude; but here as elsewhere, actions speak. Now, what we need, what the cause needs, and what the world needs, is not less of the devotional, but more of the literary and historical study of the Bible; not less of consecrated, depth-searching, spiritual insight, but more of broad-minded far-seeing, intelligent investigation. These are in no way opposed to each other. They can exist side by side. The only wonder is, that a student *can* do the one and not the other. How can the learned specialist, in his careful and exact study of the letter, fail to catch the spirit?

And how can the regenerate student, in his diligent search for the exact shade of divine truth, consent, for a moment, to allow any light which has been shed upon that truth, to go unnoticed. It is a great mistake to suppose that these two kinds of study cannot be combined; the lives and labors of many most earnest Christians and at the same time most learned students are sufficient evidence to show this. Why may not that large and growing class of Bible-students who, practically, ignore the grammatico-historical method of interpretation learn something from these illustrious men?

"GIVE me a preacher who is a 'copious' student of the Bible, who reads largely and constantly in it, and knows all parts of it, rather than one who studies it minutely and in small portions." It is in response to this sentiment that many men, gospel-preachers, excuse themselves from doing careful and exact Scripture-work, except that which is necessary in the immediate preparation of their sermons. It is desirable that the minister should know thoroughly the Bible. The practice of copious reading is one to be insisted upon. Entire books should be read at a single sitting. The entire Bible should be read through repeatedly. Let all this be done; but let not this only be done. He who would know the Bible must fit himself to do, and must do, that close and careful work which alone will make him exact, and render his wider and more general knowledge of the greatest value to him. It is the minister who generalizes and never particularizes that dies, intellectually, before reaching the age of fifty. Here again we say, the two may be combined. Let us have not one, but both. The pastor who husbands his time can do both. He can read copiously, and besides read critically. Either without the other will prove insufficient.

THE subjects of "lower" and of "higher" criticism are very frequently misunderstood and accordingly misjudged. The idea finds frequent expression that higher criticism is virtually synonymous with destructive criticism. No mistake could be more fatal to the best interests of biblical criticism than this. Lower criticism is the same as textual criticism, which seeks to restore, with the help of all the historical aids at the student's command, the very *ipsissima verba* of the writer, and endeavors to examine into the facts of the text of a book as such, and recover, wherever possible or necessary, the exact words as they flowed from the pen of the writer. It aims to rid the text of all alterations which, intentionally or accidentally, through the course of centuries, it may have suffered. Higher criticism is so called, only

because it represents a step beyond and higher than lower criticism. It takes the restored text given to it by lower criticism and examines into all the data that may be useful to the final work of exegetical study of a book proper. Higher criticism asks concerning the author of a book, concerning its age, the historical surroundings of its origin, the style and diction of the work, its internal character and structure as a literary composition—in short, the questions that hover around the human origin and side of a biblical book, and which, if rightly understood, will aid us materially in appreciating the divine contents. In itself, higher criticism stands in the service of neither advanced nor conservative theological thought. Like every other genuine theological discipline, it has no “tendency” except the search for truth, and makes its investigations irrespective of what the results prove to be. The church has ever recognized it as a legitimate science, and has at all times practiced it. Professor Green is as much of a higher critic—and we think a much better one—than Professor Wellhausen. The abuse of a thing does not do away with its use; and the more higher criticism, in the true and not in the popular false conception of the word, is practiced, the better will it be for theological science and biblical truth.

Many evidently forget that, of the charges laid to the blame of higher criticism, really a large proportion are the result of lower criticism. Not a little disturbance was raised, when the revised translation of the New Testament was published, because of the omission of the doxology in the Lord's prayer. The oldest MSS. seemed to speak against the authenticity of this doxology, and accordingly the revisers, on the basis of lower or textual criticism, decided against it. On the other hand, the church of the Reformation, by virtue of its rights to higher criticism, rejected the whole collection of books called the Apocrypha from the Old Testament canon, and Protestant theology from that day to this has applauded the act. This and similar truths and facts contribute their share to showing what attitude the careful and truth-loving investigator of God's truth shall assume in regard to some of the important questions of the hour. Will the time never come when this distinction between higher and lower criticism will be understood? Why is it, that some men will continue in a mistaken conception, in spite of every explanation? Is it not something of a *testimonium paupertatis* when Christians seem to be afraid to have the claims of the Bible investigated? It looks something like a *prima facie* evidence that they are not so sure of their case. There is no ground for any fear in this direction. One of the clearest lessons to be learned from the history of Bible-study is that every renewed re-

search into the sacred volume has only helped to place its claims upon a more solid foundation and to draw from it new truths and new evidences of its divine character. In the providence of the God of the Bible every attack upon it has proved to be only a confirmation of the truth it contains. This truth may not always be exactly what men had up to that time considered as its teachings ; but in every investigation truth has been the gainer. The contemporaries of Galileo, in the light of his science, looked once again at some portions of Scripture. They, as advocates of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, were compelled to change their views of the teachings of a number of verses of the Bible on some subjects ; but the outcome of the controversy was to the benefit of truth. It may be that in this or that particular our views of what the Bible teaches may be in error, and that a renewed search, at the instigation of negative criticism, may lead to its correction. It may be that no such errors exist even in minor particulars. But that errors touching the fundamentals of faith do not exist is shown by the unanimous teachings of the orthodox church from the beginning. Let us rest firm in the fact that truth will only be strengthened by any attack made upon it.

PRIMEVAL CHINESE LEGENDS.

BY REV. J. EDKINS, D. D.,

Peking, China.

In the department of Kia-siang, in Shan-tung, in North China, at the foot of Purple-cloud (Tsi-yün) mountain, there are the remains of an old ancestral temple of the After Han dynasty, A. D. 25 to 220. It belonged to the family of Wu, which was ennobled with the title Liang Hien, Marquis of Liang. There is to be seen there a pair of large sculptured pillars, 23 feet high. On three sides of them and in the temple are sculptures which were first fully brought to light in the closing years of last century. Rubbings can be procured in Peking of the sculptured scenes and figures, and a book is on sale which contains reduced cuts of the whole, with a collection of coins, seals and interesting old inscriptions existing in all parts of China. The book is called Kin-shi-so "catena of bronzes and inscriptions on stone." The exact date of the sculptures in this family chapel is A. D. 147. Among the curious objects represented are—

1. A creature with eight human heads and a tiger body, sitting on the hind legs with tail upwards. This is the "ruler of the waters," Shui-pak. Monstrous shapes for gods seem to have begun in Babylon, and the sea-demon Tiamet was frightful in appearance.

2. The ancient emperor Fuhü. His cap is square above and round below. He holds out in his right hand a carpenter's rule. His coat has broad sleeves and a girdle, and reaches to the knees. Below this, instead of legs a fish's tail is seen. The tail entwines with the tail of another figure wearing a marquis' cap, to whom Fuhü holds out the rule. In the centre holding the sleeves of the two figures is a little boy suspended above the entwined fish tails. An inscription says, "Fuhü, founder of the Chinese monarchy, teacher of divination, inventor of knotted cords for communicating thought."

Note.—The Chinese first began to represent Fuhü with the body of a dragon, fish, or spotted unicorn, about B. C. 400. This was the effect, as I suppose, of Babylonian art introduced into South China in the form of pictures, statues and the like, through the navigation of the Indian Ocean by vessels proceeding from India, the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea.

3. The upper part of one side of the stone temple is a sculptured pediment in the form of a gable representing clouds, dragons, gods and various mythic beings, without any inscription. A divine person is in the centre seated on a dais and wearing a six-cornered crown. The crown consists of six turrets rising in height from the outside to the centre. Wings proceed from the shoulders, one on each side. Below, a man and dragon support the dais, themselves suspended in the air. Above the god are clouds, a dragon and a bird-shaped creature with a human hand holding the cloud as a canopy over the god. On the god's left an attendant with winged shoulders holds out a knife. On the right another such attendant holds out a cup to the god. Five winged angels wearing caps having two horns or turrets, fill up part of the remaining space. Their legs are like tails. There are also two men with two heads each, and a three-headed bird with three

long spotted and striped feathers in his tail. Corresponding to this on the opposite end of the pediment is a two-headed bird with single tail, and behind it a toad. All these and other subordinate figures face the god. The Chinese editor of the collection cites, in illustration of this pediment, a passage from the Classic of the Hills and Seas, a book of about the third century before Christ, which describes similar mythological scenes. In that passage the chief divinity is named Si-wang-mu, Mother of the Western King or, as it may also be rendered, the Queen of the West. If this be so, then it is best to suppose that we have here a sort of Istar or Ashtoreth or Venus. The legend of the Queen of the West appears in China for the first time about the fifth century before Christ. The existence of sculpture in China at this early period is in itself an indication of the entrance of foreign art, and the Chinese historians complain of the love felt by the later Han emperors for foreign customs and objects of foreign art.

4. A sacred tree occurs in one scene. It has fifteen stalks, each terminated by a single globe, the fruit. A man with wings on his shoulders and a double turreted cap is plucking one of the stalks. This is a plant of good luck, which grew in the palace of the emperor Yan. A fruit stalk grew every day till the fifteenth of the month. From that time a stalk fell each day till the next new moon. Another account says the fruit pods began to fall on the sixth day. It is called Ming-kia. Kia is pod.

Another sacred plant is the *Polyporus lucidus* referred to farther on. Another plant seen in the sculptures consists of a single tall, strong leaf containing a central upright vein and closely set parallel veins proceeding from it to the sides. A man with wings stands on each side, and one of them strikes the plant with a knife.

The lotus also occurs in the sculptures in connection with a well, called wave well, Lang-tsing. When kings are pure and true, this well appears without being dug. A broad and beautiful lotus flower grows up from it, and the country people come wondering, to pluck the lovely buds and petals.

5. A god and goddess seated on clouds. These the Chinese critic supposes to be the Queen of the West and the Royal Ruler of the East, Tung-wang-kung. This he thinks likely, because, at the time when these scenes were sculptured, these divinities were great favorites in China. In the Shen-yi-king, "book of divine and remarkable matters," it is said that once a year the Queen of the West mounts on the wings of the "bird of rarity" and there, on a vast space where no feathers grow, meets the Royal Ruler of the East. An attendant holds a branch with three pearls upon it. This is probably the tree of the three pearls spoken of in the Classic of Mountains and Seas, and whose leaves are all pearls. The god and goddess have wings on their shoulders, as have all the attendants. The clouds round about are interspersed with carriages and horses, all having wings. In some of the carriages three horses are harnessed abreast. I suppose the god and goddess to be Marduk and Istar, or, as in the Old Testament, Merodach and Ashtoreth. The Assyrian Istar was winged, and held a bow. A halo surrounded her. In Buddhism the proper representative of Istar is the goddess of mercy, Kwan-yin, who saves men in misfortune and leads them to the western paradise. A halo surrounds her also.*

6. An interesting sculpture of the thunder-god borne through the clouds.

* See my "Chinese Buddhism."

Behind him a man blows from his mouth wind and fire. The god in his chariot holds a hammer in each hand. With these he produces thunder by beating on two drums attached to the car. Six youths draw the car. Far in front a dragon forms a bow and is sculptured with a head at each end of the bow, which is bent over a man who has been struck by lightning and lies prostrate on the ground. Over him is a man just about to strike him on the back of his neck with hammer and chisel. Attendants pour lightning out of a bottle. The wife and son of the man struck by the thunder-bolt fall on the ground overwhelmed with grief and fear. The dragon here is an instrument of punishment and, taking the form of a rain-bow, perhaps indicates that in this kind of ancient symbolism the rain-bow assisted in the discovery of the wicked.

7. God of the Great Bear. The seven stars of this constellation are in Chinese the northern peck measure. The god sits among the stars of the quadrangle. Three officers follow the car. Just before the god, four suppliants bow pleading for mercy. Above the middle star of the Bear's tail a winged angel holds a star in his hand. This star is β Bootes, the "beckoner." The suppliants stand under "the pointers." In Buddhism the Great Bear takes the form of a merciful god, whose worship was introduced to China from India early in the Christian era.

8. The serpent appears in these sculptures in one instance wound around a cup. Two men stand facing each other with the cup between them. They are discussing some matter, and point to it. In a companion scene a serpent has twined himself round the arm of a man who has been struck and has fallen with his knees on the ground. Before him is a man with a hammer desiring to kill the serpent, and behind him another with a hatchet. The Chinese critic cites a passage from a Han dynasty poem which speaks of serpent-charmers who can swallow knives and spit fire, and another speaks of killing a serpent-demon as thick as the nave of a carriage wheel and as long as carriage poles. Chwang-chow, the philosopher, also speaks of the same demon. The poet belongs to the second century A. D., and Chwang-tsi to the third century B. C.

9. The idea of happy islands and mountains where immortality may be enjoyed, does not occur in the collection of sculptures from which the preceding particulars are drawn. I will here add a few details respecting these and the plant of immortality taken from early Chinese authors. The poet just mentioned, in his account of the city of Chang-an, says that in the imperial pleasure grounds of the emperor Han-wu-ti were to be seen divine mountains in a lake, Peng-lai in the centre and Ying-chow and Fang-chang on each side. Woods grow on the successive terraces of these fairy mountains. Hollow caves and overhanging precipices are seen below. The wind beats against the islands near, and raises waves and foaming spray which dash over the rock fungus Shi-chiün growing upon the deeply worn bank. There is seen the glossy and wonder-working plant of good luck (Ling-chi, the *Polyporus lucidus*) with its red stem. There, too, the sea-god wanders in the deep places of the lake. Beautiful was the life of the genii here represented, who sought to ascend to the paths of the upper skies, such as he who desired to mount on a dragon from the place where the brazen tripods were cast.

In explanation of these ideas of the poet it should be understood that about 400 years B. C. the fungus *Polyporus lucidus* began to be spoken of as the plant of immortality on account, we must suppose, of its rapid growth and red color. At about the same time the idea of translation to heaven on a dragon or a stork

became prevalent in China, and the ancient emperor Hwang-ti, together with two or three more early Tauists, were supposed to have ascended to heaven in this way. It should also be noted that the lake in the pleasure gardens of the Chinese emperor which contained the islands of the immortals was imitated from the stories then rife of the eastern paradise in the ocean thousands of miles distant from Asiatic shores. The philosopher Lie-tsz describes five islands in the far east; that is to say, the three named above, and two others, called Yuen-chiau and Tai-yü. The buildings on them are of gold and jade. The trees are of pearl and coral. All have a great abundance of flowers, and their fruit is all pleasant to the taste. Those who eat of the fruit never grow old or die. The inhabitants of these islands are all immortal and holy. In a day and night they fly from one island to another, and their number is beyond counting. The islands are not joined at their base. They float perpetually as they are driven by tides and waves. The immortal inhabitants, wishing their islands to be at rest, asked God to help them. God was angry and caused them to float to the western end of the world. He then commanded Gu-gom,* god of the north, to employ fifteen great sea-monsters to give stability to the islands by carrying them on their heads in turns, changing three times in all. After 60,000 years the islands became firmly fixed in their place. There was a man of enormous size in the kingdom of the leader of the dragons who set out to go to these islands, and arrived after only taking a few steps. With one hook he drew them and six of the sea monsters (crocodiles) to him, took them on his back and returned to his country. He bored through their bones to keep count of them. Then Tai-yü and Yuen-chiau floated to the North Pole, and sank into the sea. Multitudes of the immortals were scattered in different directions homeless. God was extremely angry and punished the people of the kingdom of the dragon leaders by making them gradually shorter in stature, till, in the time of the emperors Fu-hi and Shen-nung, they were not more than a few tens of feet in height.

This story reads like a Hindoo fable. The dragons seem to be the Nagas of the Buddhist books of India. Their gigantic size is Hindoo; but I thought it best to add this feature, because I wished to show in how many particulars a certain parallel may be drawn between Tauist ancient stories and the first chapters of Genesis. The philosopher Lie-tsz lived about B. C. 450. No stories of this kind occur in the old books of China before that time. They came to China by way of India probably.

10. Lucky days. The Sabbath, in the Babylonian view, was a day for religious observances, the keeping of which led to prosperity. Babylonian usages and beliefs were diffused eastward, and hence the Hindoos first and the Chinese afterwards had their lucky days, and periods of worship continued for seven days. The week of seven days ruled over by the sun, moon and five planets, does not appear in Chinese books till after the Christian era, but in their oldest records the Chinese had lucky days. These were discovered by divination, and for sacrifices it was especially needful to select a lucky day whenever the day was not fixed by the calendar. With the Chinese as with the Babylonians the idea intended is not best expressed by our word *luck*. Lucky days were such as would bring prosperity, and it was proper to offer sacrifices on these occasions, and generally keep them religiously. But they were also selected by divination for commencing

* Can this be the Kingu of the Babylonians?

house-building or warlike expeditions, for marriages or funerals, etc. The diviner's active manipulation with milfoil stalks or the shell of the tortoise, made the suppliant acquainted, it was believed, with the sacred will of superior beings. Hence there was no frivolous idea connected with the term lucky day. In the celebrated diviner's manual the *Yi-king*, composed chiefly during the period reaching from the fourteenth century before Christ to the sixth century, a returning seventh day is mentioned; but it is connected with worship at the winter solstice. It is added that public business was intermitted by the ancient kings, and merchants rested on their journeys, gates of cities being closed. This would occur at the solstice with a religious purpose on the part of the government, in connection, apparently, with some sort of attention to a seven-days' interval, the nature of which is not clearly stated. The Sabbath then appears in old Chinese literature in its broader Old Testament sense as embracing all days set apart to rest and worship, and conducted with the expectation of a blessing to follow on its suitable observance. In regard to the order of the days of the week, it should be observed that the succession of the planets is not in all cases the same. The astrologers placed Mercury in the north (water), Mars in the south (fire), Jupiter in the east (wood), Venus in the west (metal), the center (earth) being left for Saturn. The order is said to be determined by astrology. The planets rule the twenty-four hours of the day in the following order: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon. If we begin with Saturn, the twenty-fifth hour will be the first of the second day, and will fall to the Sun. The third day will fall to the Moon, the fourth to Mars, the fifth to Mercury, the sixth to Jupiter and the seventh to Venus. This is the order in the Teutonic week. The Chinese order of the week, as introduced after the Christian era, is Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Wood, Metal, Earth, which is the same as the western week. But the Chinese, long before they had the week in this order, had the doctrine of the five elements, and in the *Hung-fan*,* a document of the twelfth century B. C., the order of the five elements is, distinctly and beyond all doubt, water, fire, wood, metal, earth. Mercury is not mentioned in Chinese books as a planet before the ninth century. The five elements then must be regarded as not necessarily founded on the knowledge of the five planets. If we ask, To what are they to be referred in nature? we must reply, To the seasons. The Chinese word for element is *hing*, "to walk," "to act." The elements are all moving powers. Therefore, the order must be wood (spring), fire (summer), metal (autumn), water (winter), earth. But neither does this agree with what we find in the *Hung-fan*; which we must, therefore, leave unexplained.

11. Waters of life. The waters of life in Hades, to find which the goddess Istar visited the unseen world, can only be paralleled in Chinese by the phrase *hwang-ts'inen*, yellow springs. Underground springs are so named as early as the *Tso-chwen*, a copious history of the fifth century B. C. It mentions the phrase "yellow fountain" in the year B. C. 721: "Except beneath the yellow fountain, mother and son will not again meet." By this, Hades is intended, but not with the fullness of detail found in the Buddhist books after the Christian era. The history goes on to say that Chwang-kung, duke of the Cheng kingdom, who had used these words in reference to his mother, still living, caused a tunnel to be made underground, and there his mother came to meet him, and his word was ful-

* This is described in my "China's Place in Philology."

filled. The Chinese at that time began to talk of a subterranean abode of the dead something in the manner of the references to Hades in the Old Testament. Afterwards, when Buddhism arrived, accounts of Hades became very minute. The descent of Istar to the subterranean world may be paralleled by Buddhist stories of persons passing through the city of the dead and returning to life to give an account of what they saw and heard. These stories are modern, and they often take the form of a dream or reverie. In ancient times, before Confucius, there was a belief in the continued existence of the soul, and this was inseparable from the worship of ancestors, but it was not accompanied by definite statement. There is one remarkable passage in the Book of Odes, B. C. 1100, which speaks of the great chieftain Wen-wang, after his death as moving up and down in the presence of God. The remarkable paucity of detailed statement regarding the future life which we observe in the Old Testament finds more than a parallel in old Chinese literature, till Buddhism brought in the Hindoo paradise and world of future punishments in their many forms.

12. Mountain of the gods. This mountain is Kwan-lun, and refers to one of the lofty mountain ranges in Central Asia. The range was known by this name before the legend of its being the abode of gods became attached to it. As the Akkadians went probably from Central Asia to Elam, where the archaeologists now place them, before their occupation of the Babylonian plain, we may identify their Kharsak-kurra with the mountain ranges in Central Asia, because they speak of this mountain, round which the starry heavens turn, as being in the east. If President Warren's view presented in "Paradise Found" be correct, the position of the mountain of the east will at a still earlier time in the history of the Akkadian migrations require to be transferred to the Arctic circle. But that is quite beyond the age of the traditions, Akkadian and Chinese, of which I am speaking. The location of Kwan-lun in Chinese tradition is in Sü,* which represents a space on the north-western horizon of thirty degrees, counting 45° to 75°, from the North Pole. The Chinese legends of the goddess Si-wang-mu and the yellow emperor Hwang-ti as residing on this mountain in splendid palaces and divine pomp, do not go farther back than the fifth century before Christ, and when they first occur it is in Taoist authors, who mix romance with philosophy. At that early time the Hindoo Sumera of the Buddhists was perhaps only beginning to assume a consolidated shape, partly because of the remarkable delay of the Hindoos to adopt the art of writing. Hence the Chinese mountain of the gods is in its appearance more Akkadian than Hindoo. In the Chinese tradition there are around the mountain rivers of five colors. The Red was the most noteworthy. The Yellow River was one of the five. The Oxus and Jaxartes, as suggested by the late Rev. J. S. McIlvaine, would be two others. A Black River on the north is mentioned. This may have been the Jaxartes. Traditions change to suit the altered position of races. A nation clings to old memories while emigrating to new scenes. So the Euphrates and Tigris took the place of these earlier rivers.

In conclusion, I observe that the translation of Elijah, placed in our Bibles in the year B. C. 921, is about four centuries earlier than the first instances of Taoist statements of the Yellow Emperor and other heroes of that religion ascending to heaven on the backs of dragons and storks. The Taoists may have received the notion from the west, from Jewish visitors.

* Some say, Sü and Hal. This would be 15° to 75° in the north-west.

NEW TESTAMENT JUDAISM AND ITS GENESIS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

With Malachi, the last of the minor prophets, the voice of inspiration and prophecy was hushed in Israel. The view that Daniel historically closes the Old Testament canon, and that we have a large number of Maccabean Psalms, are at best hypotheses, either not proved and daily becoming more and more disproved (as in the case of Daniel), or not capable of being proved in the nature of the case, as is the state of affairs in reference to the Psalms claimed for the Maccabean period. In itself the position that this or that portion of the Old Testament books is later than Malachi is neither objectionable nor dangerous; but the simple truth is that the existence of such later portions has never been proved by those upon whom the *onus probandi* rests.

The accepted chronology claims the year 433 B. C. as the date for the composition of Malachi; but it would seem that he wrote a little later. The centuries between this date and the appearance of John the Baptist, in whom the spirit of inspiration was again active, were very eventful for Israel, both externally and internally. The four centuries of silence witnessed a process and a development in the history of Israel's faith and religious convictions scarcely, if at all, equaled by any other period of the same length in the earlier records of the nation. That such is the case is evident from a mere comparison of Israel's faith, as we find it reflected in the New Testament, with the positive teachings of the Old. We need not consult the literary links that connect the two Testaments, to see that during those four remarkable centuries agents and factors were at work which changed quite radically the religion of the people, and made the Judaism of the New Testament period not a correct expression of the teachings of the Old, but rather a contradiction of these teachings. Christ, and with him the whole New Testament, opposes what was considered orthodoxy in his days, not because he was opposed to the teachings of the Old Testament, of which his contemporaries, principally the Pharisees as the official exponents of this orthodoxy, claimed to be the correct interpreters, but because he saw in this recognized system a radical departure from the Old Testament basis. Christ and his work are the fulfillment of Moses and the prophets in the divinely intended manner; and just in so far as the teachers in Christ's day oppose him, they oppose also the Old Testament teachings, to which his life and words gave the truest interpretation.

Just in what respect New Testament Judaism had actually departed from its true historical foundation in the Old Testament is evident from the Lord's teachings, and still more from the polemics directed against it by St. Paul and other writers of the New Testament. The sum of their charges is that the basis of the ground of hope, of righteousness before God, had been shifted from the true foundation to one that was false. The legalism, or the claim of a righteousness based upon an observance of the minutiae of the law of Moses, so characteristic of the New Testament Jews, is the *alpha* and the *omega* of their system. The law is their one and all; and upon obedience to it depends the sole hope of the Israelite.

The New Testament writers argue that the law was given, not to be an end in itself, but merely as a means to an end, namely, to the end that, in the recognition of the sinful condition of the heart, the child of God should flee to the gracious promises of God as these centered in the Messiah and his work; in other words, the law, according to St. Paul, was intended to be a "schoolmaster unto Christ." Instead of using it for this purpose, the Judaism of Christ's day had stopped short at the law, and had made it an end in itself, subordinating to it the words of prophecy, instead of making the law and the gospel the two mutually complementary portions of the one educational scheme recorded in the Old Testament pages. In this manner the whole character of revealed religion had been changed, and the principle of self-righteousness, or righteousness of the legal sort, had usurped the place of righteousness by faith, which already held supreme sway in the Old Testament dispensation. The attacks of the New Testament upon the teachers of the Old in that day were thus directed not against the use, but against the abuse of the latter.

This state of affairs suggests the problem as to how they entered into this condition. What is the origin and the genesis of New Testament Judaism? What were the causes and factors at work that were powerful enough to change so radically the faith of the chosen people? Evidently these false views that fell from the lips of Christ's contemporaries are not the notions of an hour, nor the mushroom-growth of a few years, or the whims of a school of philosophy, but represent the development and growth of decades and centuries. Undoubtedly the external history, the political ups and downs of the people, had not only a molding, but also a creative influence in the genesis of these peculiar views. The germs of the erratic view we must doubtless seek in the times of Ezra, and in an extreme interpretation, or rather misinterpretation, of his attitude toward the law. Recognizing the fact that the dire fate of the pre-exilic period was owing to the disobedience of the law of God by their fathers, obedience to this law became the war-cry of Ezra's reformation. We have no evidence whatever that this scribe himself purposed any other object than that which was in exact accord with the revealed intent of the law, but we have evidence in the post-exilic prophets that such incorrect positions were taken by some in his day, fundamentally occupying the same false grounds that we see later on in the New Testament so strongly fortified by the powerful system of the Pharisees and their adherents. This abuse of the truth by Ezra's cotemporaries was a step not unnaturally taken. The recognition of the observance of the law as the correct and chief means for effecting the ends of the Old Testament dispensation, easily brought with it, especially since the directing and correcting voice of prophecy was now becoming silent, an acceptance of the law as an end in itself, leaving out of consideration the real end it was intended to lead to. In this manner the age of Ezra already saw the beginning of what is completely finished and rounded off only in Talmudic Judaism.

The course of history during these centuries of silence, combined with the peculiar hopes and character of the people, was well calculated to develop these false germs, and make what seemed in Ezra's day only like a mustard seed grow into a mighty tree. Proceeding from the premises that obedience to God's law in itself, and irrespective of the ethical feature of this obedience, would secure for the Israelites the favor of God, and consequently the good things of this earth, and for the nation as such a favored and powerful position among the peoples of

the earth, the faithful in Israel found to their surprise that the actual course of their history was entirely different from what they thought they had reason to expect. With the single exception of a few years of political independence under some of the earlier Maccabean princes, during these four hundred years Israel passed from the supremacy of one Gentile nation to that of another. First, they were under the comparatively mild sway of the Persians; but nevertheless, in the erection of the temple and otherwise, they were compelled to wait for the Persian's permission. Then, after a brief Grecian supremacy, the Syrian dynasty of the Antiochian kings ruled, or rather misruled, Israel. Especially under the maniac Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes) were they compelled to drink the bitter dregs of persecution, and their sufferings were paralleled only by the early persecutions of the Christians; upon this, Syria, after a brief breathing spell, followed the Roman rule, which may not have been so cruel outwardly as was the Syrian, but which endeavored all the more to rob the people of their political and religious individuality. The people, who had hoped for so much on account of their fidelity, felt their disappointment keenly. In the Book of Enoch, written in part in the terrible days of the persecutions of Antiochus IV., the writer laments, "We hoped to be the head, and we became the tail." Other literary productions of that date echo and re-echo this thought; but the sufferings of the faithful made them only all the more zealous and all the more hopeful that their zeal would eventually be rewarded by the appearance of a powerful Messiah who would deliver his own, and establish a powerful kingdom of this earth with Jerusalem as its center. It is this line of thought that, among the New Testament Jews, so closely connects the idea of an obedience to the law, as the correct principle of revealed religion, and the carnal hopes of Israel for a Messiah of and in this world. These two thoughts and fundamental errors sprang from the same soil and grew up together, complementing and supplementing each other. The expression of these ideas is very frequently met with in the literature of the people in those days, especially in that remarkable and prolific species, the Apocalypses of the Jews, of which we have remnants yet in portions of the Sibylline Books, in the Book of Enoch, in the Psalter of Solomon, in the Apocalypse of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, and a few others. Probably the most characteristic of them all is the Book of Enoch. There, and in the others, the faithful are urged to continue steadfast in their obedience, being told that for such obedience the rewards shall not fail, that the days of the persecution are numbered. The Lord himself, or his Messiah, will come with great might and power, and will destroy those who maltreat the Lord's people; and the fidelity of the latter will secure its full reward in the Messianic kingdom. Such are the leading thoughts of all these works, modified according to the peculiar time and circumstances that surrounded the writing of the work. Thus, in the older portion of Enoch, written in the terrible days of Judas Maccabeus, the idea of a bloody vengeance on the persecutors of the people, through the intervention of God and his Messiah, is the all-controlling idea. In the latter portion of the book, written when the Herodian dynasty was seeking to introduce an intellectual rationalism into the religion of the people, and to establish an aristocratic indifferentism in the ruling classes, the Messiah is represented rather as a powerful teacher sent from God to establish, even by the use of the sword, the true wisdom and philosophy. The so-called Psalms of Solomon, written when Ptolemy had established the Roman dominion

in Jerusalem, paints the Messiah as a mighty king, the true son of David, who will destroy the rule of the wicked stranger.

What added fuel to this fire was the fact that the oppressors of Israel endeavored to rob the people of their religion. The whole period is one of constant struggle between the religion and culture of Israel, and the religion and culture of Greece. A Hellenistic party then always existed in Palestine and, chiefly through the Sadducees and others, exerted a powerful influence, even in royal and priestly circles. Antiochus IV. went so far as to order all the copies of the Scriptures found in the land to be burned; the Romans set up their eagles and images in Jerusalem, to the horror of all the Jews, who would not allow images to be made. These endeavors of the Gentile conquerors compelled the faithful all the more to cling to the legacy of their fathers, to the law and the other sacred books; hoping that, when the time of persecution should be over, and the people should have been tried as if by fire, then the hour of deliverance would come, and the true Israel, that had not fallen from the high estate of being God's chosen children, would receive their reward in the glorious kingdom to be established by the Messiah.

Such was the fate of the people, and such were the thoughts that filled their souls during these eventful years. In the light of these facts, it is not an historical enigma how the Judaism of Christ's day became such as it was. It is capable of a rational and historical explanation, and is the result of factors at work during the centuries between the two Testaments. Israel's fatal error during this period consisted in this, that the people, instead of following the word of revelation alone, allowed the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows of the hour to warp their judgment and misinterpret the deeds and words of Jehovah. Consulting flesh and blood, and not the word of truth alone, in matters of faith and doctrine, will, in the nature of the case, ever lead to error more or less fundamental.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

By PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

OCT. 10. JESUS BEFORE PILATE. ¹ John XVIII. 28-40.

OCT. 17. JESUS DELIVERED TO BE CRUCIFIED. John XIX. 1-16.

OCT. 24. JESUS CRUCIFIED. John XIX. 17-30.

Who were the Jewish men who secured the death of Jesus? To what extent were their proceedings legal, according to the Jewish usages of the period? How do the usages thus exhibited compare with those described in the Old Testament?

The high-priest Annas, of the gospels, is undoubtedly the same whom Josephus calls Ananus the elder, and perhaps elsewhere Ananias. He was made high-priest by Roman authority, the 37th year after the battle of Actium, say, 7 A. D. (Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. 2, 1). He held the office about fifteen years, and was deposed by Roman authority. After a short time, his successor was deprived of the office in favor of Eleazar, the son of Ananus. Eleazar was high-priest for one year, and his successor for one year, after which Caiaphas became high-priest,

shortly before Pilate became governor, and continued in the office until about the close of Pilate's administration. He was high-priest about eleven or twelve years, to about 37 A. D. His pontificate began not very much earlier or later than the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus (*Jos. Ant.* xviii. 2, 2). After Caiaphas, there were perhaps a dozen successive high-priests, four of whom were four other sons of Ananus (*Jos. Ant.* xviii.-xx.). In his narrative of these later times, Josephus speaks of high-priests as if there were several high-priests at once, constituting a class, and not one high-priest only; his narrative implies that Ananus and many others who had held the office survived to nearly the time of the taking of Jerusalem by Titus; he calls Ananus "the ancientest of the high-priests" (*Jos. Ant.* xx. 8, 8; *Wars*, iv. 3, 7). Annas, his five sons, and his son-in-law Caiaphas held the pontificate, off and on, for more than half the time from the year 7 A. D. to the destruction of Jerusalem. With two short intervals, three members of the family held it consecutively from the time Jesus was eleven or twelve years old till after his death.

The word translated "chief-priests" in the English versions is uniformly the same with that translated "high-priest." It would perhaps be better always to translate it high-priest, leaving the reader to judge for himself, in each case, whether it is used strictly, or as the name of a class. Now it is this class of high-priests, including particularly Annas, Caiaphas, and "the kindred of the high-priest" (if that be the true translation in Acts iv. 6), who appear in the New Testament, first, as carefully watching the proceedings of John the Baptist and Jesus, and afterward, as the leaders in the attempts to destroy Jesus and his disciples. Whoever else may have been included in this body of high-priests, it is certain that Annas and his family connection were the ruling spirits among them. They were men of courage, ability, and political ambition. They had Sadducean affiliations (Acts iv. 1-6); the last high-priest of the family, the younger Ananus, was distinctively a Sadducee (*Jos. Ant.* xx. 9, 1). It was a part of their policy to receive spoils of office from the Romans, in exchange for influence. Such men might well be envious when they saw Jesus actually wielding that influence in the nation which they themselves needed to seem to wield. What if Pilate should take a notion to strike hands with the rising teacher, and appoint some friend of his high-priest, instead of Caiaphas! It was all the worse because Jesus taught steadily the theological system of the Pharisees, and to that extent weakened the influence of the religious heads of the nation, in favor of that of the Pharisees, who were already their too powerful rivals in the esteem of the public.

Associated with the high-priestly party in enmity to Jesus were men who are variously called scribes, elders, and Pharisees; the last of these three terms would include most of the persons who are also denoted by the other two terms. The fact that Jesus taught mainly the same religious and moral doctrine with the scribes rendered them the more displeased that he refused to recognize their traditions as authoritative, and distinctly opposed their attempt to use religion for establishing a mental despotism over men. Through their success as expounders of the law, these men had acquired such an influence that they were courted by both Jews and Gentiles who had anything to seek from the Jewish people. They were the popular leaders of the times. Even those members of the high-priestly party who were opposed to them were obliged to seek alliances among them when they had plans to carry out. The success of Jesus was undermining their influence. He openly opposed many of the practices in regard to the sabbath, the cer-

emonial law, prayer, etc., on which they relied for training the people to habits of obedience to their teachings; he taught all people to receive the Word of God directly, rather than through the medium of the scribes.

Either of these parties would probably have welcomed Jesus with open arms, as an ally against the other. An alliance with either would have made him practically the head of the Jewish race throughout the world, opening before him, had he been so disposed, an almost limitless field for worldly ambition. Up to the crucifixion week itself, the tempter never ceased to show him all the kingdoms of the world, and to say, "All these will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Jesus refused both alliances; he stood in the way of both parties, and affiliated with neither. High in power in both parties were a certain number of unscrupulous men. Opposed, as they were, each to the other, they were willing to combine for the destruction of the man whom they both hated. How extensive the combination was, we have no means of knowing; it is certain that many of the members of the Sanhedrin were either in it, or at least under its influence; but the fact that it had not power enough so that it dared to venture upon the public arrest and open trial of Jesus shows that it was a combination, not of the whole body of the two parties, but of only a few leaders in each party.

The council, the Sanhedrin, the legal body, in which the enemies of Jesus took their action against him, was made up of priests, scribes and elders. Doubtless the Pharisaic scribes and those who held with them had a large majority, in a full meeting, while the leaders of the high-priestly party were pre-eminent in personal influence. That Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea were members of this council is not so directly stated in the gospels as the readers of the English versions would suppose, but is undoubtedly the fact (John III. 1; VII. 50; Mark XV. 43; Luke XXIII. 50, 51). It is at least as probable as the contrary that Gamaliel already held the same enlightened views which he so influentially expressed a few years later (Acts v. 34-39). In view of the fact that Nicodemus, at one consultation of these men, and Gamaliel, in a meeting of the Sanhedrin, had influence enough to break up the proceedings then pending against Jesus or against his disciples, it is evident that the combination against him could not always have their own way, even in the council itself.

There can be no doubt that the gospels represent that a meeting of the council was called, when Jesus was arrested, and that he was subjected to some kind of an examination before it; but was this examination of the nature of a legal accusation, trial and condemnation? In opposition to the substantially unanimous opinion of Christian interpreters, I am constrained, on the evidence, to answer this question in the negative.

Jewish scholars, assuming that the gospels describe a legal trial and condemnation of Jesus, impugn the historical correctness of the gospels, by showing that such a trial as the gospels describe would have been contrary, in many essential points, to Israelitish law as held by the scribes. To have been a legal court, for example, the meeting should have been held in the *gazith*, and not in the high-priest's house; it should have been presided over, at that time, by Gamaliel, and not by the high-priest; the vote should have been taken man by man, beginning with the youngest, and not by acclamation; the trial could not have been had in the night; the sentence of guilt could not have been pronounced until the day following the trial, nor the execution have taken place earlier than the day after the sentence. For other like points, with references to authorities, see McClintock

and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, or other current books of reference. Christian scholars meet these objections by explaining the law differently, in some cases, or by asserting that perhaps some of the precepts found in the rabbinical writings were not in existence in the time of Jesus, or by urging certain passages which make an exception of the case where a man is tried for pretending to be the Messiah. Perhaps these answers to the objections might be sufficient, if the gospels anywhere affirmed that Jesus was subjected to legal trial under Jewish law; but in the absence of any such affirmation, it is more natural to understand that the evangelists intended something different from a legal trial. They describe what actually took place, and it is something not at all like the idea of a legal trial, as that idea existed, so far as we can ascertain, in the minds of the men who had Jesus in their power. It is true that they were men in official place, and could have put him upon trial, had they been disposed; but it does not follow that they actually did put him on trial. It is true that more or fewer of the men who would have formed the court for trial were got together, and that some sort of a hearing was had before them, but it does not follow that this hearing was other than preliminary and informal. Before Pilate, they urge, among other things, that Jesus has broken Jewish law; but they do not urge that they have tried him and found him guilty of breaking the law; on the contrary, they refuse Pilate's suggestion that they should take Jesus and judge him according to their law. To judge him according to their law was to acquit him, and they must have known it. Perhaps they themselves, amid the solemnities of a court of justice, would not have ventured to vote for his conviction, and they could still less depend upon their colleagues. Rather than risk the results of a deliberate trial and an orderly verdict, they preferred to break up the meeting of the council, with the outcry that he was worthy of death, and then to depend upon persuading or browbeating or fooling Pilate into committing the judicial murder which they themselves shrank from committing.

In all these matters, we catch glimpses of an order of administration in affairs, based, indeed, upon the Mosaic legislation, but radically different, in many respects, from anything observable in the Old Testament. Probably no one ever thought of these differences as proving that the Pentateuch was not yet in existence. We should be rather shy of arguments based on similar differences for disproving the existence of the Pentateuch at certain earlier periods. We should be yet more shy of the assertions as to the cast-iron changelessness of the Jewish laws and of the interpretation of them, now so recklessly made in so many quarters.

In John XIX. 24 is a literal citation of Ps. XXII. 19, which needs no comment. In XIX. 28 is the formula "that the Scripture might be fulfilled," with what is commonly supposed to be an allusion to Ps. LXIX. 22.

OCT. 31. JESUS RISEN. John XX. 1-18.

NOV. 7. THOMAS CONVINCED. John XX. 19-31.

Is the doctrine of the resurrection taught in the Old Testament? Certainly it is not taught prominently and centrally, as it is in the New. But throughout the Old Testament books, there are isolated passages, some of which seem to imply the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, and others distinctly to express it. There is a considerable amount of this kind of matter, as one would see, if he should collect all the passages. The question is one of interpretation. Are we to infer the absence of the doctrine from the general silence of the Old Testament

in regard to it, and then to infer that the passages which, on their face, seem to teach it, must therefore be otherwise understood? Or are we to infer that the doctrine was known in the Old Testament times, but that there was some reason for keeping it in the background in the Scriptures of those times? If this latter alternative is feasible, there is no difficulty in our understanding in their most natural sense the Old Testament passages that seem to refer to a future life. I have only to state the question, not to argue it. But any one who thinks it to be historically true that Israel was in close contact with Egypt, for some centuries before the publication of the Mosaic laws, will hardly doubt that in the times of Moses the doctrines of a future state, a resurrection, and future retribution must have been familiarly known to Israelites, and must have been either accepted or deliberately rejected; and one who holds thus will hardly, in the entire absence of positive proof, accept the latter of the two alternatives.

A BOOK-STUDY: ISAIAH XL.-LXVI.

BY PROFESSOR WM. G. BALLANTINE, D. D.,

Oberlin Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. It is assumed that the student has become familiar with the general aim and method of these book-studies from those upon the Books of Samuel. Most of the general remarks prefixed to the preceding studies are applicable to this.

2. As the purpose of these studies is original knowledge at first hand, the student is earnestly advised not to consult any commentary or other work of reference until he has well advanced in both the analytical and synthetical study of the book.

3. In no part of the Bible does the superiority of the Revised Version over the old version appear more conspicuously than in Isaiah. No one ought to think of using the old version except for comparison. Students who understand Hebrew will yet find the Revised English Version best for such work as this. The use of the original is mainly valuable in the special study of minutiae.

4. After a fair amount of original study be sure to read chapters XIII.-XV. in volume VI. of *Geikie's Hours with the Bible*. Other works which may be consulted are: *Encyclopædia Britannica* and Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopædia*, articles Cyrus, Babylon, etc.; *Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church*, lectures XLII. and XLIII.; *Rawlinson's Oriental Monarchies*, the Fifth Monarchy, chap. VII. Among commentaries those of *Delitzsch*, *Nügelbach* (*Lange* series), and *Cheyne* may be recommended to the professional student. For the general student the *Speakers' Commentary* (called also the *Bible Commentary*).

5. The Book of Isaiah contains sixty-six chapters. The prophetic discourses are divided into two sections by the insertion of four historical chapters (XXXVI.-XXXIX.). The chapters (XL.-LXVI.) following this division constitute one distinct and continuous discourse, and may be studied as one complete whole.

6. The question of the *unity of the authorship* of the earlier and later prophecies attributed to Isaiah is one of high interest; but it is not possible to do more than throw a few side-lights upon it in the present study.

7. The outline for synthetic study is very incomplete. Let the student fill in the points that have been omitted.

II. DIRECTIONS.

A. ANALYTICAL STUDY.

1. First, *master the contents of the section* as follows:—

a. Read over as rapidly as possible the whole of the twenty-seven chapters, and decide upon their general subject, tone and purpose.

b. Read again, this time more slowly, and *make an abstract*; that is, condense into as few words as possible the main thought of each paragraph. Care will be needed *not to make this abstract too minute*. There are seldom more than half-a-dozen main thoughts in a chapter.

c. Write down on suitable slips of paper this abstract as you proceed. State, not what each paragraph is *about*, but what it *says* about its subject. For example, in an Eyre and Spottiswoode Bible open before us, the 40th chapter of Isaiah is thus headed: "1. The promulgation of the gospel. 3. The preaching of John the Baptist. 9. The preaching of the Apostles." etc. This is a fine example of how not to do it. A genuine abstract would run somewhat thus: "God commands to comfort Jerusalem with the news of pardon (1, 2). A voice bids prepare the way for God's coming through the wilderness (3, 4). God's glory shall be revealed (5). Flesh is grass, but the word of God is everlasting (6-8)," etc.

d. Study this abstract over until you can begin at the beginning and give the whole to the end without looking at the written slips.

2. Secondly, *make an analysis of the section*.

a. Select a general theme for the whole; as, "Redemption: its Author, Agents, Subject, Method and Consequences."

b. Notice that there are twenty-seven chapters—three times nine. Try whether three divisions of nine chapters each can be naturally made.

c. Compare the closing verse of the first group of nine chapters (XLVIII. 22) with the closing verse of the second group (LVII. 21) and the closing verse of the third group (LXVI. 24).

d. See whether some one topic is not most conspicuous in each group of nine chapters. Is it not, in the first group, God's attributes and promises (theology proper)? In the second group of nine chapters, is it not the Servant of Jehovah and his saving work (soteriology)? In the third group of nine chapters, is it not the new heavens and new earth and last things in general (eschatology)?

e. Try whether each group of nine chapters is susceptible of subdivision into groups of *three* chapters treating a common theme.

f. Select for each chapter an appropriate heading. Notice what correction should be made in the present division of chapters. For example, does chapter LIII. begin at the right place or should it begin at LII. 13?

g. Consider the whole section as the libretto of a great oratorio, and divide it into arias, recitatives, and choruses accordingly. Compare the rhetorical structure, with its recurrences and anticipations of themes and motives, with musical structure.)

B. SYNTHETIC STUDY.

Let us construct now the biblical theology of the section. Make a memorandum of all texts in this section bearing upon the following points:

a. THE DOCTRINE OF GOD (theology proper).

- (1) *God's Natural Attributes.*
 - (a) The divine unity.
 - (b) God as Creator.
 - (c) God as Ruler of the natural world.
 - (d) God as Ruler of men.
 - (e) God's wisdom.
 - (f) God's strength.
 - (g) God's eternity.
 - (h) God's foreknowledge. Study carefully these passages: XLI. 21-29; XLIII. 8, 9; XLIV. 7, 8, 25, 28; XLV. 21; XLVI. 10, 11; XLVIII. 3-8. Consider in the light of these passages the argument that the mention of Cyrus by name proves the prophecy to have been composed in his time.
- (2) *God's Moral Attributes.* Make a list of all passages bearing upon each of the following points:—
 - (a) God's holiness. By the aid of a concordance count how often the name "Holy One of Israel" occurs in the earlier prophecies of Isaiah (chapters I.-XXXV.); count how often it occurs in the later prophecies (XL.-LXVI.); how often in all the rest of the Bible. Probable origin of Isaiah's use of this name (VI. 3).
 - (b) God's gentleness.
 - (c) God's condescension.
 - (d) God's quickness to forgive.
 - (e) God's faithfulness.
- (3) *God contrasted with Idols.*
 - (a) The materials of idols.
 - (b) The makers of idols and their manner of work.
 - (c) Contrast of God's relation to his people and that of idols to their worshippers; for example, in respect to *being carried*.
 - (d) Prophetic power of God compared with impotence of idols.

b. DIVINE GRACE AND MAN'S SIN.

- (1) Circumstances and moral condition of those to whom the prophet proclaims salvation.
- (2) The spontaneity of divine love.
- (3) The terms of salvation.
- (4) The universality of the offer.
- (5) Faith.
- (6) Works.
- (7) Figures of salvation; water, light, etc.
- (8) The discipline of affliction.

c. THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

- (1) *The meaning of the title.*
 - (a) Texts indicating that this title refers to the nation of Israel.
 - (b) Texts which seem applicable to but a single person.
 - (c) Consider in the light of all these passages the view of Delitzsch that the use of this title may be illustrated by three concentric circles. In its widest use it comprehends all Israel, good and bad; in a narrower sense, spiritual Israel; in a still narrower sense, only that "holy Servant" of God, Jesus (cf. Acts iv. 27, RV.).

(2) *The Work of the Servant of Jehovah.*

- (a) His foreordination.
- (b) His gentleness.
- (c) Classes for whom he works.
- (d) Elements of his humiliation. Compare with the details of the sufferings of Jesus given in the gospels.
- (e) The vicariousness or substitutionary character of his sufferings.
- (f) His strength and victory.
- (g) The universality of his work.
- (h) Elements of his exaltation.
- (i) Causal connection of his humiliation and his exaltation.

(3) What elements of the complete Old Testament doctrine of the Messiah are lacking in this section? How about the Davidic king, divinity, etc.? Contrast the Messianic doctrine of Isa. I.-XXXV.

d. ETHICAL TEACHINGS. The prophet's doctrine regarding—

- (1) Sacrifices and ritual.
- (2) The sabbath.
- (3) Spiritual worship.
- (4) Beneficence.
- (5) Enumerate the sins condemned.

e. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS (eschatology).

- (1) *The Future Home and Condition of the Saved.*
 - (a) The place. (b) Divine presence. (c) Peace. (d) Pardon. (e) Things possessed. (f) Liberty. (g) Supremacy. (h) Health. (i) Immortality.
- (2) *The Ruin of the Wicked.*
 - (a) Its certainty. (b) Completeness. (c) Various figurative representations of it. (d) The shame of it. (e) Examine carefully the passage LXIII. 1-6. Find all other passages in Scripture referring to treading the winepress. Consult any works of Oriental travel accessible, as to how those nations regard treading the winepress. What do the grapes here represent? Does this passage refer at all to our Lord's sufferings? If not, to what does it refer?

C. COLLATERAL READING.

Study up the following points:

- a. The history of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and the march through the desert.
- b. Israel's relations to Edom.
- c. Babylon. Its rise, greatness, and fall. The captivity of Israel in Babylon and treatment there. The sins of Babylon, especially her idolatry, divination, magic, etc.
- d. Cyrus. The principal facts of his life. His religion. His relations to Babylon and to Israel.
- e. Make lists of all the animals and plants mentioned, and learn what you can of each.
- f. Note all references to the domestic or public life of the times, articles of luxury, weapons and usages of war. Consult works of reference regarding these.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

The general idea of the kingdom of God is that of a state of society where the will of God is supreme. There his commands are known and loyally obeyed in all the departments of human activity. The subjects in this kingdom are in intimate fellowship with their ruler. In our own day we have seen the elements of the kingdom of God set forth as the family, the church and the state. In the Old Testament we find no separation of these elements, although we find the family recognized as having a value in and by itself.

I. PROVIDENTIAL PREPARATION FOR THE BIBLICAL IDEA OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The origin of this idea was partly due to revelation. It is said, partly because there is a basis in human thought for this idea. Even if a primeval revelation be urged as the source of the fundamental religious ideas of the human race, there is no reason to include this idea in the primitive revelation. Such a revelation would by necessity have concerned the conditions of the human race to whom it was given. If given, it was given to a family, not to a nation, and the idea of a kingdom is impossible until a nation is formed. Not until Israel had become a nation did the idea of a kingdom emerge. This idea, as has been said, had a basis in human thought. It is therefore like all the truths of revelation in having a point of contact by which it attaches itself to the human soul. It would be very misleading to say that revelation from God was knowledge which had no likeness or relation to what man already knew. Revelation came to men who were beginning to feel their need of further knowledge, and gave them what they could not learn otherwise. It comes also to the aid of the confused minds of men, and sets in order what they already know; it purifies the true ideas already gained from the errors commingled with the truth; it completes the half truths, giving the full circle of truth. It seems also to have come at times to quicken human desire for knowledge, but always in relation to previous human thought and experience.

We note, therefore, several human conceptions which served as a basis for the idea under discussion. First, is the idea of society, with mutual duties. This is an idea which was developed by the very necessity of human thought, and is so obvious that it needs no further discussion. Second, is the recognition of the divine headship of the nation. This appears in extra-biblical races. Many heathen nations accepted the belief that the deity is essentially and naturally connected with his worshippers. This is seen in those mythologies where the race of man was traced to one or another of the gods. It must be observed that the rulers of the nation rather than the subjects were believed to be in intimate relationship with the deity. The ruler was the representative of the god, and in some sense his embodiment. If one consult the "Records of the Past" he will find numerous expressions of such sentiment. It was by the might of the gods that the ruler ascended the throne, waged wars, conquered enemies. Sennacherib says (Vol. I., p. 25): "Assur, the great Lord, has given to me an unrivalled monarchy. Over all the princes he has raised triumphantly my arms." (Vol. I., p. 59), "I

am Assurbanipal, the progeny of Assur and Beltis, son of the great king of Riduti, whom Assur and Sin the lord of crowns from days remote, prophesying his name, have raised to the kingdom." See also Vol. I., pp. 62, 101; V., p. 7; III., p. 83; IX., p. 3; XI., p. 17. The gods are constantly represented as showing a lively interest in the affairs of the king, as commanding him to go on his campaigns, as accompanying him and giving him success. Of a similar nature are the translations of inscriptions made by the Persian kings. (Vol. IX., p. 75), "A great god is Ormuzd who has created this earth, who has created that heaven, who has created the man, who has given to man the Good Principle, who made Darius king, sole king of many kings, sole emperor of many emperors." (P. 113), "Says Darius the king:—Within these countries whoever was good, him I cherished and protected; whoever was evil, him have I utterly destroyed. By the grace of Ormuzd these countries have obeyed my laws." See also pp. 74, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86. In Homer also the chief among the Greeks are *θεῖος* *divine*, *Διοτρεφής* *fosterlings of Zeus*, and *Διογενής* *born of Zeus*. Their physical origin is traced back to the deities, as well as their authority. Here we have a third element for the development of the idea of the kingdom of God. It is in the implication of a similar nature in God and man. The Greek believed in such a similarity so far as the chief families of Greece were concerned. The nations often seemed to have believed it of their kings. In most instances this idea found expression in attributing the origin of ruling families to the deity by physical generation.

A point of divergence between the heathen idea and that of the kingdom of God must be noted. In the heathen mind an ethical character is not regarded as the ground of connection between the god and his servant. Commonly the god himself is not righteous. A righteous god, when in the pantheon, is frequently not supreme. In no case that I have noticed is righteousness regarded as a ground of connection between god and man, and rarely is anything like righteousness necessary to secure the favor of the deity. The high-water-mark of heathen thought, so far as I have been able to discover it in extra-biblical thought, is in the teaching of Socrates and Plato, that righteousness is essential to the well-being of society or of the state. This, however, is not exactly in the line of our thought.

Again, heathen thought had not the idea of a universal deity, of one God as a basis for our idea of the kingdom of God. The gods were national or tribal; one nation had one god, another nation another god or gods. The question which agitated their minds was which nation had a greater god. The success of the arms of the Assyrians, or of the Chaldeans, or of the Persians, showed which gods were supreme, whether Assur with the associated deities, or Marduk, or Ormuzd. Cf. 2 Kgs. XVIII. 33-35; Isa. XXXVII. 12, 13. The conquests of Sennacherib had been made because his gods conquered the gods of other nations. The idea of a universal empire, however, seems to have had a place in the minds of Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian kings. It is possible that, from the attempt of these kings, some influence may have come in preparing the thought of men for the later prophetic ideas of the kingdom of God.

All these ideas seem to have been more or less prevalent among the Israelites. Indeed, except by long training, they could not escape the influence of opinions which so saturated the surrounding peoples. It may be that for generations a large fraction of the nation looked upon Yahweh as Sennacherib looked upon Assur. Judg. XI. 24 would seem to show that such was the belief of the half heathen Jephthah.

II. ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS ADDED BY THE OLD TESTAMENT REVELATION.

The contributions of revelation, either in providence or in word, to the kingdom of God were, a formal basis of such a kingdom, and a knowledge of God.

The formal basis of the existence of the kingdom of God was a covenant made with Abraham. This covenant with Abraham was included as an essential part of it. Abraham's relation to his posterity, the formal basis of this kingdom, cannot be separated from the material basis, which was Abraham's family developed into a nation.

The great gift of revelation was the knowledge of God, and by consequence, the knowledge of his will. If Yahweh were in a true sense a king, the beliefs of the heathen peoples were partially true. It was no mistake to refer government to God; the trouble among the nations lay in their lack of knowledge of God and of his will. What distinguished Israel from other nations was, that to some extent, however vaguely, Israel knew God. Object-lesson after object-lesson was held up to them—the expulsion from Paradise, the deluge, and history of Abraham, of Jacob, the exodus and its attendant mercies and punishments, the punishments for idolatry and apostasy, the prosperity in periods of faithful service—all these in line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, had come to their heart and mind, in order that they might gain some knowledge of Yahweh, even though it were imperfect.

The idea of God which they were taught was that Yahweh loved Israel, that he loved righteousness still more, and that, best of all, he loved Israel when striving after righteousness. It was a pre-eminence of Israel that its laws came in some special sense from God, and that these laws were interpreted and applied by men who were his representatives.

This revelation of God laid hold of those ideas already mentioned as current among extra-biblical peoples. The idea of physical derivation was rejected and was replaced by that of creation of a person by a person. The idea of connection with a people through its head became real by virtue of the covenant with Abraham. This covenant had been made with Abraham, not personally, but in virtue of his position as progenitor and founder of a righteous nation. The promises to Abraham were a race inheritance. The idea of God as a source of power is simply indispensable to any religion, and of course was not omitted in the Old Testament teachings. These added the idea of righteousness as an essential and dominant constituent.

The Old Testament idea of God as the source of power had the specific idea of kingship in it. This idea of God as king was that he is the leader of the nation in war, the judge and shepherd of the people in peace. These were common ideas of the human kingship, not only in the Old Testament, but also in other ancient literature.

To anticipate a little, we notice the following facts respecting the human divine kingship as indicated in the Old Testament. Leadership in battle is one of the two marks mentioned as suitable to a king, when the people asked Samuel for a king (1 Sam. viii. 20). Even when Joab went forth as captain, David was commander-in-chief. Yahweh is also represented as fighting with his people. He fights for them as well, and interposes on their behalf. The battles of the people with foreign enemies are his battles. Judgeship is the other function mentioned in 1 Sam. viii. 5, 6, 20. It is attributed to God by Abraham (Gen. xviii. 25). Elsewhere is God often spoken of as a judge, or as judging. Because

God applies the principles of natural justice his decisions are called judgments. The earthly king is also conceived of as a shepherd. It is an interesting fact that Schrader finds (*Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*, on Zech. ii. 5) an inscription in which Sargon was called a true shepherd. The ποιμήν λαῶν of Homer is familiar. So also is Yahweh called a shepherd, and Israel a flock.

In regard to the ascription of kingship to God, we find it first in Exod. xv. 18. The providence of Yahweh, his successive judgments on Egypt, the calamities and successes of Israel were taken as proof of his kingship. In Israel it is high treason to curse him. Every oath in Israel must be by him. He is superior to all earthly kings, who are crowned or deposed by him, and his messages are to be heard by them all.

HOW TO SEE PALESTINE.*

BY THE REV. HENRY W. HULBERT,

Beirut, Syria.

Dr. Philip Schaff in his volume entitled "Through Bible Lands," says:—"I would advise every theological student who can afford it to complete his biblical education by a visit to the Holy Land. It will be of more practical use to him in his pulpit labors than the lectures of the professors in Oxford or Cambridge, in Berlin or Leipzig, valuable as these may be. The best thing, of course, is to combine the most thorough theoretical study and personal experience on the spot." In another place he adds—"The benefit of travel depends upon the disposition and preparation of the traveler. * * * The more knowledge we carry with us the more we shall bring back." This being true of theological students, it is obvious that a man who has had several years of practical work in the ministry might receive even more benefit.

Dr. Howard Crosby once said to the writer that some years ago he made a proposition to the trustees of a prominent theological seminary to the effect that he would help them raise a fund of \$1,000,000, with the interest of which to send ten young men from each class graduating from that institution to Palestine to study a year. Owing to certain other urgent demands for money, the project was not carried through.

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd strongly recommends students who look forward to the practical work of the ministry to go to Palestine rather than to Germany. I have before me similar statements from a dozen prominent authorities on this subject. They urge the homiletical value of such a trip.

But how can all this be brought within the reach of those who might be benefited by it? Dr. Crosby suggests one solution. It takes time and money to extract from a trip to the land of the Bible the best results. A hurried rush through the country gives a very inadequate notion of things. A man must settle down at some favored spot and get thoroughly initiated into Oriental ways. He needs to read his Bible through amidst the scenes it depicts. If the theological seminaries could come to the aid of the student by offering scholarships of \$500 for

* From *The Independent* (Sept. 9th).

this purpose, the study of Bible Lands would receive a new impetus, and the practical results would be revealed in many a pulpit.

The millennium, however, has not come, and the inquiry arises: How can such a trip be undertaken, inexpensively, under present circumstances? Hoping that they may be of service to others, the writer gives a few of his experiences.

On going to the Orient one finds that he has to turn his back upon all thoroughly equipped libraries. As one writer says: "You can at least make a dash through a limited territory, gather together a few facts, and then return to the libraries of Europe and America to digest them."

For the study of Greek history and literature, the friends of learning in America are establishing a school at Athens, and within a few years the student will have every facility for a practical and thorough study of ancient Greece. No institution of this kind for the far more numerous students of the Oriental languages and peoples and especially of the Bible, is to be found in the East. Neither at Cairo, Jerusalem, Beirut, nor Constantinople, are there facilities for an exhaustive study of Eastern life, history, and literature, sacred or profane.

Of these centers, however, Beirut, Syria, offers by far the best advantages. It is not generally known that the Syrian Protestant College throws open its doors to students of Bible Lands. Its location is central. The cities of the "Seven Churches of Asia," Tarsus and Antioch, are only two days' sail to the north. Cyprus is one day to the west, Damascus one day to the east, and Jerusalem one day to the south (via Jaffa). Beirut and its neighboring mountains are the health resorts of the Levant. Skillful physicians and commodious hospitals are near at hand. Situated on a promontory, it is always favored with sea-breezes and has a most beautiful outlook of water, plain, and mountains.

The college occupies a fine site on Ras Beirut, has three large and well appointed buildings, the beginning of a good library, and valuable collections of the fauna and flora of Syria. The commodious building of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary is situated on the college grounds, and contains a small but very superior theological and missionary library. The libraries of the professors and missionaries are rich in books on the study of the Bible and of Oriental life. It is expected that in a short time the valuable library of the American Palestine Exploration Society will be deposited at the college.

But what is perhaps quite as valuable as books, Beirut has the inestimable advantage of having a large corps of men who have spent their lives in studying Oriental character and ways, and whose experiences are at the disposal of all students of the Bible.

The college furnishes a pleasant room, lights, fire, washing, and good table board for four months or more at the rate of \$6 per week. This also includes instruction in Arabic for at least two hours a day. A limited number of men can make arrangements to tutor two hours a day in the college or in the town for the college year, and pay their way. The college authorities have also a standing arrangement by which they send out graduates of American colleges for three years on a good salary. At present there are six young men occupying such positions. Several students have taken advantage of the facilities the college offers. One who returned to America last summer is now a professor of Oriental languages in a western university. A Fellow from Harvard College and a recent graduate from the Union Theological Seminary of New York, are at present making the college their headquarters.

A pleasant way is to leave New York early in July, and spend three months on the way to Beirut via London, Paris, the Rhine, Vienna, the Danube, Constantinople, and Smyrna. The month of October can be spent on the Lebanon, and visiting Damascus, Baalbec, and Hermon. Nov. 1st settle down at Beirut for five months of hard study. It is well to purchase a horse on first landing (horse and equipments \$75). Having thoroughly studied up Palestine, and learned the ways of the natives, one is prepared in April for an extended trip down through the country. It can be done inexpensively and leisurely with a tent and native servants. A dragoman is not necessary. Two weeks can be spent in and about Jerusalem. After six weeks in the saddle, and having done thorough work, one can sell his horse for about its original cost, and take the steamship at Jaffa for Alexandria. The last two weeks in May are not too hot for a glimpse at Lower Egypt. June 1st take steamship at Alexandria for Brindisi, and see Italy at its best. Or one can secure passage for Liverpool direct at the astonishingly cheap rate of \$50 first class.

The Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, 11 Cliff Street, New York, is the corresponding secretary of the Syrian Protestant College, with whom the above arrangements can be made. \$800 is a liberal allowance. With economy, \$600 will do. With tutoring, \$400.

▷BOOK ◊ NOTICES.◀

BIBLE HISTORY.*

What teacher has not groaned in spirit because of the lack of a proper text-book in Bible history? Smith's Old Testament and New Testament Histories have been the standards for many years; but how uninviting they are; how deficient in vividness, in arrangement, in the presentation of the results of recent investigations!

Professor Blaikie's work has been in the market some years; but for some reason has not gained the recognition which it deserves. It is a small work, but the enlargement which it needs can well be performed by the teacher and student. It furnishes an admirable outline for a thorough and comprehensive course of Bible history. The division of the material into sections, with the topic of each section indicated in heavy type, is to be commended. Perhaps the value of the book cannot better be shown than by quoting from the author's preface its characteristics: "(1) It follows the stream of biblical narrative, arranging and classifying the leading facts, so as to aid the eye and the memory in grasping the whole. (2) It keeps in view, throughout, the great spiritual purpose of revelation, and shows its gradual development. (3) For illustrating the narrative it takes advantage of the mass of biblical illustration of which recent years have been so prolific, in researches, monuments, travels, and expeditions in Bible lands. (4) It notices briefly the chief countries, towns, and other scenes of Bible history as they occur. (5) It glances at the parallel history and progress of the leading nations of the world,—showing what was going on elsewhere while the history of the Bible was being enacted. (6) It traces the progress of religious knowledge by which it was made known, and the state of social and spiritual life at different periods, partly in other nations, but especially among the Israelites. (7) It fills up the interval between the Old Testament and the New, so as to throw light on the great changes that had occurred between the time of Malachi and the appearance of our Lord."

This history is not a perfect one. There are several points which would improve it, e. g., the insertion of much additional matter in the form of foot-notes; but it may be said that, for the average Bible class, whether in Sunday-school or Divinity school, it is the handiest and most satisfactory book to be had.

LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTES.†

No book more difficult to handle than Ecclesiastes is to be found in the Old Testament. The lectures before us were delivered on Saturday afternoons, begin-

* A MANUAL OF BIBLE HISTORY in connection with the general history of the World. By the Rev. Wm. G. Blaikie, D. D., LL. D. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. London and New York: T. Nelson & Sons. 1882. 8vo, pp. 504. Price, \$1.75.

† LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTES, delivered in Westminster Abbey by the Very Rev. George Granville Bradley, D. D., Dean of Westminster. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1885. 8vo. Pp. 133. Price, \$1.10.

ning in November, 1884. It is certainly an evidence of great interest in biblical study, that so peculiar a book as this could have attracted "many, men and women, young and old, not a few of them men immersed in the busy and anxious life of the great metropolis."

The author disclaims all pretention to originality. "He has read much and thought much on every line," and his effort is to give in as clear a form as possible the results of his reading and thinking. That he does not enter upon his work without a due appreciation of the difficulties which it involves, is evident from the forceful presentation of these difficulties. That he undertakes his task for the sole purpose of getting at the truth, is evident from the fearless manner in which he characterizes the ordinary absurd and, indeed, ridiculous exegesis by which the "book becomes no longer a serious study for earnest men, but a pastime for grown-up children, a playground for trifling pedants."

He grants the uninteresting character of the book, as judged from almost every stand-point, yet shows that "those dreary sentiments, those disjointed proverbs, those hollow wraiths of unavailing consolation, those wearisome repetitions, those unintelligible utterances, those terrible pictures of human destinies, those snatchings of startling and, as it might seem, wholly irreligious teaching, those 'hard sayings' gather a fresh interest as we try to track them through their many windings to their true sense and actual teaching." They contain "no body of Christian doctrine wrapped up in unchristian form, but that which is at all times one of the most moving of all spectacles—the human spirit led to face in hours of gloom its relation towards the world and towards its God—struggling with the same problems that vex our souls, and feeling its way through a night of darkness to some measure at least of light and knowledge."

In his second lecture the authorship and age are considered, and satisfactory reasons given why Solomon *could* not have been the author, or Solomon's age given birth to such a production. In the whole treatment, which follows through ten lectures, there is a freedom from traditional prejudice, an honest searching after the exact meaning of the words, that is refreshing and helpful. These lectures are to be commended as presenting in easy shape, the general results of modern investigation in relation to the Book of Ecclesiastes.

EARTH'S EARLIEST AGES.*

The aim of this book is to show that the characteristic features of the days of Noah are reappearing in Christendom, and, therefore, that the days of the Son of Man cannot be far distant. The introduction, after enlarging upon the danger to Christianity resulting from so much diversity of Bible-interpretation, and showing how this diversity began, even in the early church, indicates how all these diversities might be brought to an end, and then proceeds to show the importance of the study of prophecy. Chapters II.-X. include discussions of "The Creation," "The Interval" (viz., after the destruction of a pre-adamite race, as a result of which the earth came into a state of desolation), "The Six Days," "The Creation of Man," "The Fall of Man," "The Trial and Sentence," "The Age of Freedom," "The Days of Noah." Of the remaining chapters three are on "Spiritual-

* EARTH'S EARLIEST AGES, and their connection with Modern Spiritualism and Theosophy. By G. H. Pember, M. A. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1885. 8vo, pp. 481. Price, \$1.75.

ism," one on "Theosophy," one on "Buddhism," and one on the "Signs of the End." The stand-point of the author will easily be learned from the closing sentence of his preface: "But many signs appear to testify that the hour of the Powers of Darkness is again approaching—that eclipse of faith which, it is foretold, shall precede the coming of the Son of Man."

The author's theory is that God created the world, and made Satan prophet, priest and king over it. Satan and all the inhabitants of this pre-adamite world sinned; and for their sin the world was destroyed. This pre-adamite race was probably swallowed up by the sea, where they now are as evil spirits and demons.

In order to give Satan another chance, there is a second creation, described in Gen. 1. 2 seq.; but he still remains disobedient, bringing confusion into this world also by seducing the woman. And now, "when no other created being could be found able to restore the confusion, the Lord Jesus himself came forth from the Godhead, to take the misused power into his own hands, and to hold it until the rebellion be altogether suppressed, and every trace of it obliterated." It is these pre-adamite beings, evil angels and demons, who were the heathen gods. By them even the motions of the elements are directed; for, when our Lord arose from his sleep and "rebuked the winds and the sea, it cannot be supposed that he was chiding the mere rush of the blast, or the senseless waves; but, rather, those malignant spirits of air and water which had combined to excite the storm."

It may not be out of place to give one or two illustrations of our author's exegesis. The "seed of the woman" cannot be mankind, for that would be called the seed of the man. None but Christ could in a *literal* sense be exclusively the seed of a woman. In this prophecy, therefore, it is declared that Christ is to be born of a virgin. And so Isaiah (vii. 14) says *the virgin*, referring to this prophecy and meaning the particular virgin to be chosen for the fulfillment of it. In discussing the character of the cherubim he says that it is set forth by the name Kerubim, which is derived by separating it into two words, *ka* (= like) *rubim* (= many).

According to Mr. Pember, "since the first man was able on the very day of his creation to give names to beasts and fowls, it is evident that language was a gift bestowed upon him by God, when the breath of life was breathed into his nostrils. Christians, therefore, cannot countenance the speculations of modern philosophers in regard to the gradual development of speech."

Our opinion of this work may be stated briefly. It contains scarcely a sound statement from the first page to the last. It is built upon the most fanciful and absurd theories of interpretation which can be possibly conceived of. There is no indication in it of true scholarship. It is a long series of vagaries, each one more preposterous than the preceding. It is a cause for extreme regret that there are men, leading ministers in our churches, who read and accept and commend such unreliable teaching. There may be good ground for pre-millenarianism; but surely this author has lost sight of the aim of his book.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Commentarius in Prophetas Minores.* Auctore Josepho Knabenbauer, S. J. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux, 1866.
- Der altchristliche Graberschmuck.* Ein Beitrag zur christl. Archaeology. By A. Hasecnecker. Braunschweig: Schwetschke & Sohn. Pp. 286, gr. 8. M.5.—
- Beitraege zum positiven Aufbau der Religionsgeschichte Israels. I. Die Bildlosigkeit des legitimen Jahwecultus.* By E. Koenig. Leipzig: Doerfling & Franke. 1886. Pp. 32. M.0.60
- Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* By W. Vatke. Nach Vorlesungen herausgegeben von H. G. S. Preiss. Mit einem Vorwort von A. Hilgenfeld. Bonn: Straus. 1886. Pp. xviii, 754. 8vo. M.10.—
- Vie, doctrine et gouvernement authentiques de Moïse, d'après des textes hébraïques de la Bible jusqu'à ce jour complètement incompris! 3e et dernier fascicule du Pentateuque selon Moïse et du Pentateuque selon Ezra.* By A. Weill. Paris: Lib. Alcan, 1886. Pp. 217 a 418, 8vo. fr.2.50

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran:* Vols. II., III. By Rev. E. M. Wherry. (G. P. Badger) in *Academy*, Aug. 21, '86.
- Biblical Topography.* VII. Egyptian Sites—Zoan and Pithom. By Rev. Canon G. Rawlinson, M. A., in *Monthly Interpreter*, Sept., '86.
- The Pentateuch: its origin and structure.* By E. C. Bissell. (G. F. Moore) in *Theol. Lit. II.*, No. 17.
- Christianity and the Mysteries.* No. III. By Rev. Prof. E. Johnson, M. A., in *Monthly Interpreter*, Sept., '86.
- The Story of Creation: a plain account of Evolution.* By Edward Clodd in *Knowledge*, Sept., '86.
- The Minister the Interpreter of God's Word.* By Prof. E. L. Curtis in *The Interior*, Sept. 16, '86.
- The Preacher as an Interpreter.* By Rev. Geo. A. Gordon in *Andover Review*, Sept., '86.
- The Hebrew Feasts in their relation to recent critical hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch.* By Prof. W. H. Green. (G. F. Moore) in *Theol. Lit. II.*, No. 17.
- The Jews, in Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Times.* By James K. Hosmer in *Spectator*, Aug. 28, '86.
- The Rise of Arabian Learning.* By Edward Hungerford in *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct., '86.
- Egyptian Divine Myths.* By Andrew Lang in *Nineteenth Century*, Sept., '86.
- Oriental History.* By Prof. A. H. Sayce in *Contemporary Review*, July, '86.
- The Book of Zechariah.* V. Religious Observances. By Marcus Dods, D. D., in *Expositor*, Sept., '86.
- History of Interpretation* (The Bampton Lectures, 1885). By Frederick W. Farrar. (John Owens) in *Academy*, Aug. 21, '86.
- Among the Tablets.* *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, Sept. 22, '86.
- Roman Jurisdiction in Palestine.* By Prof. Wm. C. Morey, Ph. D., in *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 25, '86.
- Oriental Seals.* By W. Hayes Ward, D. D., in *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 11, '86, pp. 579-80.
- Solomon's Temple.* By T. O. Paine. (G. F. Moore) in *Theol. Lit. II.*, No. 17.
- Recent Assyrian and Egyptian Literature.* *The Expositor*, Sept., '86.
- Der gegenwaertige Stand der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft.* By H. Steiner in *Theol. Ztschr. aus d. Schweiz*, '86. 2, pp. 88-99.
- Studies in the Minor Prophets. Joel.* By Rev. Prof. R. A. Redford in *Monthly Interpreter*, Sept., '86.
- The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart.* By Prof. Milton S. Terry in *Pulpit Treasury*, Sept., '86.
- The Preservation of the Jews an Illustration of the Divine Government.* By Prof. E. J. Wolf, ib.
- The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt.* By Rev. Edw. H. Jewett, S. T. D., in *Church Review*, Aug., '86.
- The Patriarchal Times. X. The Case of Abram.* By Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, D. D., in *Monthly Interpreter*, Sept., '86.
- The Revision of the English Old Testament.* By Rev. Prin. G. C. M. Douglas, D. D., ib.
- The Prophets and the Exile.* By Rev. S. R. Calthrop in *Unitarian Review*, Sept., '86.
- The Spread of Jewish Christian Ideas among the Egyptians.* By Prof. Wessely in *Expositor*, Sept. 26, '86.
- The Land and the Book.* By W. M. Thompson. (G. F. Moore) in *Theol. Lit. II.*, No. 17.
- Het oorspronkelijk Mozaïsche in den Pentateuch.* By J. J. van Tootenbergen in *Theol. Studien*, 1886, 2, pp. 92-108.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

NOVEMBER, 1886.

No. 3.

OF the many difficulties which present themselves to the thoughtful Bible-student, no single class is more noteworthy than that class which includes the New Testament interpretations of various Old Testament passages. From the beginning of the Christian era to the present time these difficulties have been discussed. It would seem to be impossible for interpreters to agree upon any set of principles in accordance with which these "citations" might be satisfactorily explained. In this issue, our readers will find a brief statement from the well-known exegete Professor Franz Delitzsch. For the accuracy of these statements, the translator takes the responsibility. For the statements themselves, those who cannot accept them may hold the learned Professor accountable. The presentation will be found, at all events, a clear and interesting one.

OUR age is, in a peculiar sense, an age of activity. Every department of study is pushed with a vigor before unknown. Nowhere, however, is this more true than in the Old Testament and its closely allied departments.

These departments, to be sure, have to do with the past. But it is a "past" that still lives in a multitude of forms. The Old Testament world of to-day is a busy one. Discoveries are being made before which men stand aghast. Investigation is being pushed in every direction. Publications are leaving the press almost daily. The leading reviews give large space to the discussion of Old Testament topics. Semitic chairs are being established, and professors of Semitic subjects appointed in many leading institutions. All this is of interest. These details are worthy of notice. Our readers will find in

this and succeeding numbers of THE STUDENT a new department, *Old Testament Notes and Notices*, in which there will be chronicled, from month to month, interesting and important items relating to Old Testament work and Old Testament workers. This department, it is believed, will prove to be one of great practical value to those who are interested in this field of study.

WHY should not the study of the biblical languages be a matter of conscience to the minister of the gospel? Strictly speaking, unless he can read the Old Testament in the Hebrew and the New Testament in the Greek, his knowledge of all things pertaining to his work is second-hand. There are, of course, good translations and commentaries upon which he can depend, and for practical work this may suffice. And yet the fact remains that he himself cannot draw from the original fountain of truth or decide whether what is offered him by others is still in its original purity. The Bible being *the* source of his faith and work and inspiration should, if at all possible, be accessible to him in the very form and words in which it came from the inspired minds. Does a minister really appreciate what he does when he deliberately decides *not* to fit himself to do such work?

WE need not be surprised at the comparatively cold reception which has been accorded to the revised Old Testament by the English speaking peoples. Such a work must find its way into general acceptance gradually and upon the recognition of its merits. The fate of the German revision shows this. For, although this translation is more conservative in character than the English, its progress in the land of biblical criticism, where, of all lands, such a revision would be supposed acceptable, is even slower than that of our revision among us. Such cautious conservatism, however, is by no means an evil. If the revisions have living merits they will live; otherwise, their fate is sealed.

IF the full benefit of the study of biblical history is to be secured, it must be conducted with the proper aim and in the proper spirit. The aim should be not to acquire the facts for the sake of the facts, but to acquire them for the principles and lessons which lie behind them and which they were intended by revelation to teach. The great truths of revelation find expression not only or even principally in abstract statements, but especially, and often with wonderful clearness and emphasis, in the history of the people and of the individuals whose

life was to be the expression of these truths. God's dealings with Abraham or with David, these two best representatives of Old Testament religious life, the development of their faith and the virtues of this faith under the guidance of God, in fact their lives as a whole, teach us, when rightly apprehended, as clearly concerning the plans of God and the truths of revelation as do the more abstract and direct teachings of the sacred books. The whole history of the children of Israel is the expression of the plans of God for the unfolding of his kingdom on earth. This is much more true than that the history of the church is the expression of the New Testament ideal; for the people of the Old were to a greater extent under the direct and theocratic guidance of God, than are those of the New; and so the history of the church of the Old Covenant, i. e., Old Testament history, is for this purpose especially instructive. It is God's revelation in deeds rather than in words; and in many instances the truths underlying the former are more transparent than those expressed by the latter.

THE proposed reconstruction of Israel's history and of the development and course of Israel's religion, as is proposed by the works of Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade, and others, aims to construct an historical and religious scheme which shall in all particulars resemble that of the religious growth of other oriental peoples. It endeavors to write a history of this religion as the result of factors and agencies such as are found in all other nations. Kuenen, the boldest of his class, states as one of the principles underlying his entire work, that the "religions of Israel and of Christianity are one of many; nothing less, but also nothing more." The aim is, therefore, to eliminate from the history of Israel the characteristic element and thus accommodate it to the general scheme of the philosophical science of Comparative Religion. This attitude of the advanced critics is the fundamental error of their whole work. It is possible that a thoroughly critical and scientific history of Israel's religious development will differ in this or that feature from the traditional views of the church. But any account of this history which proceeds from the premises that the origin, character and growth of this religion were essentially the same as those of the surrounding gentile nations, condemns itself. If there is one thought that pervades the documents from which alone an historical account of this religion can be drawn, viz., the Old Testament books, it is that the religion of Israel is the special revelation of God, the only true worship in the midst of errors; just as the God of Israel is the only true God. No possible "doctoring" of the authorities and sources can remove this feature; and since the proposed reconstruction pro-

ceeds from this violent misconstruction of the sources of this history, we may feel assured that the sober second thought of scholars will deprive the new views of the large number of adherents which thus far they seem to have secured not only in Holland and Germany, but also in England and America.

SHOULD one be inclined to think that the Old Testament contains only law and no gospel, or an insufficient amount of gospel to bring light and life to erring souls, let him read the Psalms with open eyes. The instinct of the best Christians of all ages of the church has led them to see in the Psalms the richest expressions of every phase of Christian feeling, from the deepest humiliation caused by a consciousness of sin, to the highest exaltation resulting from a recognition of blessings already given and in store for the redeemed, who are accepted by Jehovah. It is for this reason that the Psalms have always been the favorite source for Christian hymnology. The singers in Israel have drunk deep draughts at the fountain of divine mercy, and gratitude inspired them to utter that of which the heart was full. Christians in troubles, trials and temptations, find the Psalms a never-failing source of comfort; those weak in faith find strength there; those who are strong find there words and thoughts which only others equally strong were able to utter. The Psalms are replete with the gospel.

Nor is Isaiah lacking in this regard. From the fourth Christian century he is frequently called "the evangelist of the Old Testament." The name is well chosen and the honor well bestowed. An "evangelist" is one who heralds the *evangelium*, the good news concerning the salvation achieved for man. No other man in the whole pre-Christian period has done this better than has the son of Amoz. In many regards, his prophetic eye seemed brighter and more penetrating, and to him the future seemed more transparent than to his brethren; and to none other was it given to speak so clearly concerning the consummation of the plans of God and the fulfillment of his promises in the person, words and works of the Messiah. While the others speak more of the Messianic kingdom in general, Isaiah dwells more largely upon the person and the personal work of him who was to establish this kingdom. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the central jewel in the Old Testament crown of prophecies, found in Isa. XL-LXVI., reads not as a prediction written seven hundred years before the advent of the Nazarene, but like a historical record penned under the cross upon Calvary, and inspired by a full conception of the significance of the event.

PALESTINE EXPLORATION, WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. MCGARVEY,

Lexington, Ky.

The survey of Western Palestine, from the sea to the Jordan, and from Dan to Beersheba, has been so thoroughly accomplished by the officers of the Palestine Exploration Fund of Great Britain, that nothing more remains to be done in that section so far as the surface is concerned. The results of this work are fully exhibited in their immense map of this section, and the seven quarto volumes which accompany it. The map is by far the largest ever made of Palestine, being drawn on a scale of one inch to the square mile, and it is the only one prepared from such information as could make perfection a possibility. The South Country, which lies between the southern border of Palestine proper and the desert, and which was at one time occupied by Israelites, should be surveyed and added to the map, and then the surface work west of the Jordan and the Dead Sea would be completed.

East of the Jordan but little has been done in the way of mathematical survey, and no map approaching strict accuracy has ever been made. If the reader will compare any two maps not copied one from the other, he will see, by their differences, how unreliable they are. Soon after the close of the war in the Sudan, Capt. Conder, who had been called into active service during the war, was sent back to Palestine to complete the survey work of the Exploration Fund by surveying beyond the Jordan, but he had scarcely begun the work when the Turkish government stupidly ordered its discontinuance. There is no doubt that this organization will renew and finish the undertaking as soon as the governmental opposition can be overcome. Probably the best way to overcome it would be by the total overthrow of the opposing government, and this is liable to occur as the result of the great eastern war which is imminent.

But after the surface of the country shall have been accurately surveyed and exhibited on maps, our knowledge of many interesting questions will still be incomplete, until we shall have gone down beneath the surface, and brought up the records which may lie buried in Palestine, as we have brought some of those buried in Assyria, Babylonia and Egypt. It is highly probable that among these are to be found the most valuable relics of antiquity. The whole civilized world has been thrilled of late by the account of unwrapping the mummy of Rameses II., the pharaoh who first persecuted Israel, and by the description of his person which has gone abroad into the newspapers of every land. When the world gazes upon his photograph, taken 3500 years after his death, it will be hard for any one to doubt the account of him which is given in the Bible. But what is this discovery compared with unwrapping the mummies of Jacob and his son Joseph, and actually laying hands upon their foreheads, looking into their sightless eyes, and sending their photographs around the world? This is not beyond the bounds of possibility; for Jacob's body, embalmed like the body of a king, was laid away in the rock sepulchre of Machpelah, and there it lies yet, unless it was removed at

an early day. The spot has been guarded by stone walls and a jealous people for many generations past, and it is still so closely guarded that no human being is allowed to enter the sepulchre. An hour's work might perhaps be enough to determine whether the patriarch still lies where he was placed by his sons and the elders of Egypt. Joseph, too, was embalmed, and after being kept in Egypt in a coffin, doubtless of granite, until Israel was delivered, he was buried in the piece of land which his father bought near Shechem. His tomb is there to this day, and a few hours' work with pick and spade would tell us whether his mummy is yet there. These are burning questions, and to be kept in suspense about them, when, but for Mohammedan superstition, they could be so easily settled, is quite annoying.

There is another question quite similar in the interest attaching to its investigation and the ease with which it could be investigated, to the two just mentioned. It is the question concerning the nature and design of the sacred rock under the Dome of the Rock, and of the well which descends from the cavern beneath it into the heart of the temple mount. No one who has ever entered that sanctuary, gazed upon the unshapen mass of dusty limestone which is covered by the costly structure, entered the artificial cavern beneath it, and stamped his heel on the circular marble slab covering the well's mouth, and heard the deep reverberations below, can be content to let that slab remain unlifted, as the Mohammedans say it must, until the day of judgment. We wish to lift it at once. We wish to descend the well, see to what it leads, and make it reveal the purpose of its own existence and that of the rock above it. We wish to make it give up its treasures of ancient history; and should we find in some of its dark recesses, as the Jews believe we would, the ark of the covenant, we would value it above its bulk in solid gold. Nothing stands in the way of the search except the unreasoning superstition of the Mohammedans, who will not go in themselves, and who hinder those who would.

But besides these places of special interest and easy access, there are hundreds of others in Palestine where judicious excavations might determine important questions of topography, bring to light historical inscriptions on stone, and add largely to the evidence of the accuracy of the sacred narratives. Almost every ruined town and village shows, cropping above the surface, the upper courses of buried masonry, which, if disinterred, might tell an interesting story of the ruined city on which the modern village is built. The same is true of Jerusalem itself, concerning which many questions remain unsettled which can be settled only by investigation beneath the surface. Doubtless the Palestine Exploration Fund of Great Britain, which has done so much already in the line for which it was organized, will continue its operations; but it should not be left to do the work alone. Some organization in America should be effected to share in the expense, the labor, and the honor connected with the investigation. The co-operative organization which we once had, and which commenced a work beyond the Jordan that was full of promise, has long ago lapsed into inactivity and perhaps into dissolution. Why not revive it?

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO,

Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

III. THE INAUGURATION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

This was at Sinai. From a very early period the Old Testament had contrasted the people of God with other peoples. It first appears in Gen. iv. and v. In Gen. x. 8 seq. this contrast heightens into a distinction between God's people and a world-kingdom, which is a distinction that never disappears. The real beginning of the kingly rule was when Yahweh bound the tribes of Israel into a community by the formation of a legal covenant. This covenant was the constitution of the kingdom of God. It had been necessary to make a preparation for this inauguration of the kingdom, even as a preparation was needed for the coming of Christ. The ideas previously mentioned were a part of this preparation. The family of Abraham had been enlarged to a tribe—to a race; the furnace of affliction in Egypt and the wonderful deliverance under the guidance of Yahweh made the race a nation; the preparation was completed; the kingdom was inaugurated, for a fullness of time was reached. The records respecting the inauguration of this kingdom are in Exod. xix. 3-19; xx. 18-21; xxiv. 3-8. The covenant proposed by God was verbally accepted by the people at once, and later it was formally ratified.

In Exod. xix. 3-6 we find that God's assumption of the kingship is based upon his deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Even as to-day we assure the saint and sinner alike that they belong to God by virtue of a redemption wrought out in Christ, so Moses and the prophets always based God's peculiar claims to Israel upon the deliverance from Egypt. There is, however, a yet broader presupposition, i. e., that Yahweh owns all the earth. As all other nations have forsaken God and know him not, God left them and chose Israel as his peculiar people, and this for some reason of his own. In this choice there was also an element of separation or exclusiveness. This exclusiveness was temporarily external. Although there was to be forever an inner separation, the outer separation was not an essential or permanent characteristic of the religion. The real meaning of the exclusiveness concerned a holy character, and that has not abated even at this day.

The purpose of this choice was to bring Israel into intimate relations with God. They were to be priests, i. e., servants to God; holy, i. e., dedicated to him. The exclusiveness was not explained save that it was based upon their relations with God and that it was for the purpose of maintaining these relations.

IV. THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS A THEOCRACY.

In the historical development of this kingdom it has been called a theocracy. All political powers were united in God, and he ruled through such agents as he chose. The character of the agent was no essential element in the theocracy, provided he was sent from God. Neither was a constant miraculous element necessary more than it has been in the Christian church. The great fact was that Israel was in covenant with God, so that they were his peculiar people and he

their chosen king. The agent in this theocracy might be prophet, as Samuel, priest, as Phinehas, or king, as David, or a special servant, as Joshua or Gideon. Still the theocracy was established through the mediation of a prophet, and a prophet was regarded as occupying a chief rank among the agents in the theocracy.

The privileges in this kingdom were the nearness of God (Deut. iv. 7, 8) and a righteous law (Deut. xxxiii. 3, 4; iv. 6). This relation had been entered as a matter of choice, hence it was a moral relation; it recognized duties and obligations, hence it required discipline. Such was the ideal of the kingdom at the time of its inauguration.

The ideal has been given in outline; preparatory thoughts have been noticed: e. g., the contrast between God's people and those who were not God's people; the family covenant with Abraham now ratified as a national covenant; the idea of kingship and of divine headship outside of recorded revelation; also the idea of the kinship between human and divine persons—all these had brought to pass the fullness of time—a fullness as necessary as that when Christ should come—when the kingdom of God should be inaugurated. It is, however, to be remarked that at the very outset the people accepted the relation, entered into covenant, but were incapable of entering into the full privileges of the covenant. Instead of entering into a direct personal relation with God at once, they (Exod. xx. 19) asked for a mediating agent from God. This proved one thing at least, that they had not appropriated that degree of revelation which had at that time been given them. Thus it came to pass that from the outset the settled usage of the kingdom was that the subjects should approach their ruler only through a king, who in turn delivered the king's message to them.

The history of the kingdom of God in Israel shows that the government of the kingdom was carried on through mediating agents wholly. At no period did more than a few choice spirits seem even to desire to enter into that familiar relationship with Yahweh which was the ideal of the Sinaitic covenant. Yet this ideal of universal privilege ever remained that to which the chosen agents of the king always strove to lead the people.

V. TRANSITION UNDER SAMUEL.

There was no substantial difference in the attitude of the people until the time of Samuel. The people apparently felt the ideal of the kingdom to be too high for them ever to attain unto. They renounced the possibility of becoming a kingdom of priests, having Yahweh alone as king, and of being each directly governed by him. They accepted their spiritual incapacity as a settled state of things and demanded a human king. As has already been indicated, the theocracy does not necessarily exclude a king, the very conception of civil society implies or requires organization and headship. The conception of direct relationship with God does not necessitate the exclusion also of mediate relationship. On the other hand, the request for a permanent order of kings, who should constantly mediate between God and his subjects in all the functions of kingship, this request was not a declension, but an acquiescence in a state out of which they had never risen.

This appointment of the king did not make Israel any less a kingdom of God than before; it rather sent the people to the king as God's representative, and did not invite them as a whole directly to God. This was a part of the honor due to the king in his representative capacity. In fact, that which was due to the king in this capacity was carefully defined (1 Sam. x. 25). In a less conspicuous

manner there was set up beside the royal office another permanent power as a balance—and a corrective of possible abuse. This was the prophetic order. Previously there had been no prophetic order, although there had been prophets. The great aim of this order was to lead Israel to render actual the ideal of the kingdom, in other words, to observe the covenant made at Sinai. They saw no way to the establishment of the kingdom save through the observance of the Mosaic law as based upon this covenant. During successive generations they penetrated more and more deeply into the meaning of the covenant, and accordingly they were not satisfied with the former standards of obedience. As one contest with disobedience followed another, sin was found to be more profound in its nature, and righteousness broader in its scope, and to require deeper foundations than outward obedience.

VI. DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE KINGS.

While the history of the prophetic order followed the course just indicated, the history of the kingly order took a direction of its own. The occasion which called this order into being was the wars waged between Israel and its neighbors. The struggle for existence was finally brought to a triumphant issue by David. These wars and conquests nurtured the national consciousness and made it perhaps as perfect as it ever was before the captivity. With this development of the national consciousness came a development of the kingdom of God. David as the theocratic king recognized as never before the nature of the kingdom and of the proper human kingship (2 Sam. xxiii. 3). It was seen that righteousness was the fundamental law of this kingdom, whoever might administer it. This idea of an earthly sovereign ruling in direct responsibility to a righteous God and for the purpose of maintaining righteous principles gave a perfected standard for judging human kingdoms, a standard which later prophets used. It was seen, however, that this ideal was realized in Israel only as the king was a devout worshiper of Yahweh.

The history of the next two hundred years after the death of David was the history of an attempt to realize as fully as possible the ideal of the kingdom proclaimed at Sinai. By the necessity of the case this ideal was more fully unfolded. Two centuries of king and prophet showed it impossible to bridge the gap between the actual kingdom and the ideal. In this period there was not merely the failure to rise, but there was a practical renunciation of the covenant. This had its beginning in the reign of David, who most perfectly realized the standard of the theocratic king. The beginning was slight. It was the marriage with a foreign princess. The immediate result of this and of the numerous marriages of a similar character on the part of Solomon was to form political and commercial relations with neighboring nations. The exclusiveness which was essential to the kingdom of God was lost. The influx of foreign ideas and customs was partially checked from time to time by some king who labored in harmony with the prophetic order. The kings often opposed the prophets and gave their influence to the promotion of foreign customs and heathen worships. These seemed to have attained their height at the time of Athaliah. The worship of Yahweh had come to be as the flippant Charles II. said of Presbytery, "no religion for a gentleman." The reaction against this downright paganism was successful; but it was followed by a formalism which was deadening to the spiritual life. The remainder of the independent history of the nation was an alternation of paganism and the formal worship of Yahweh as the religion of the controlling classes of the nation.

VII. EARLY PSALMS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The idea of the kingdom of God as seen in song is extremely interesting. The true kingly character as recognized by David has been mentioned (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-7; cf. Ps. lxxii. and ci.). The prevalent idea of the earlier psalms which mention the kingdom of God is that of the splendor of the king, the greatness of his power, the universality or permanency of his reign (Ps. xlv., lxxii., cx., cxxxii.). Some psalms represent Yahweh as judging his people, or all the earth, or as ruling or possessing the same (Ps. ix., xxiv., l., lxviii.). Also the earthly king is set up by Yahweh. Here the future joins right on to the present and was but a glorified development out of it.

VIII. THE KINGDOM OF GOD DEFERRED TO THE FUTURE.

Each century after David saw the actual kingdom receding more and more from the ideal even of its songs. The heightening ideal of the prophets did not raise the people. At last a change in the situation was accepted by the prophetic order, the past was flung away, the present development was accepted as transitory, and the establishment of the kingdom of God came to be regarded as possible only by a complete renovation of society then existing. As has been seen in Samuel's time, the people failed to rise to the privileges of the Sinaitic covenant. Before Isaiah's time (about 750 B. C.) the people had declined so far as practically to reject this covenant. This rejection had never been formal, but it was real. It had come to pass that when unrighteous kings adopted a foreign worship the people as a body followed them. Righteous kings never succeeded in undoing this work. Foreign influence became more and more operative in the life of Israel; this change had been largely enhanced by the division into two kingdoms.

The activity of the prophetic order took on a new form. At the outset they had sought to secure righteous government by the kings. Later they came more fully into relation with the entire life of the nation. The arts of the orator came into prominence. From about the beginning of the eighth century B. C. their labors included the formation of a literature. Such prophets as Elijah (called prophets of action) had tried to secure some form of obedience to Yahweh—to secure recognition of Yahweh as the God whom the entire nation ought to worship. They were able to secure a nominal worship of Yahweh. The labors of such prophets as Hosea and Isaiah (called literary prophets) were to secure real worship of Yahweh. These efforts were based upon the Sinaitic covenant. When the people had practically disowned the covenant while professing service to Yahweh the prophetic activity must necessarily undergo some modification.

IX. THE CHARACTER OF THE WORK OF THE PROPHETS.

The general nature of this activity was twofold. It was ethical and gracious. They were teachers of righteousness and messengers of grace. As teachers of righteousness they were expounders of the Sinaitic covenant. Although it was really disowned by the people, the prophets had no authority to abrogate it. The earlier and non-literary prophets were almost wholly ethical. There were occasional exceptions, e. g., 2 Sam. vii. 12 seq. All prophets were ethical prophets. They asserted the reign of a moral law over all men and the government of a God who executed this law. They announced retribution for sin, destruction upon unrepentant sinners, but deliverance and reward for righteousness. In this function their predictions were, in part at least, conditional. The character of the conditions can be seen in 1 Sam. ii. 30; Isa. i. 27; xlviii. 18, 22. They pre-announced

the destinies of nations outside of Israel. They taught the nature of God and the universality of his power. The prophets did not create these ideas. God gave to Israel their lofty ideas of himself—not by abstract statements, but by deeds—the call of Abraham, the exodus, the settlement in Canaan and the subsequent guidance.

So far as God was conceived or taught as a God of grace there was room for development outside of the Sinaitic covenant. As an ethical teacher, the prophet could teach the grace of God as a motive to righteousness. As merely an ethical teacher, he could not pledge that grace in the future. The basis of the work of the prophet as a minister of grace is earlier than the Sinaitic covenant. It may be believed that the paradisaic promise of deliverance, Gen. III. 15, was one element of the basis. The most important element was the promise to Abraham, Gen. XII. 2, 3. With these should be joined 2 Sam. VII. 16; Deut. XXXII. More and more the prophets came to be preachers of sovereign grace. Israel was to be blessed, and through Israel all nations. They freely pledge divine forgiveness to the future times. These promises were unconditional, i. e., irrespective of present human conduct. A new covenant pledged, Jer. XXXI. 31 seq., is the classic passage. The hope of Jeremiah was not that Israel would do better, but that God would do more. No covenant of works would suffice—one of grace was necessary. The constitution of the kingdom of God as proclaimed at Sinai revealed the defects in human nature, and these defects were to be provided for. The present constitution of things was accepted as totally inadequate, and the kingdom of God was regarded as belonging to the future rather than the present. The prophets sketched the ideal of that kingdom of God.

X. MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

The prophetic utterances sketching the transformed ideals of the kingdom of God constitute Messianic prophecy. Earlier Messianic prophecy is expressed in the lower hopes of the Davidic psalms, but the acme of prophecy is found when the hope and ideal is transformed. Even when changed, there were great underlying features of identity. The divine kingship, a covenant, also the exclusive possession by God of his subjects, were in the new ideals. There is to be a righteous representative of God ruling righteous subjects. These were not hinged on the present good behavior of Israel, but God is the prime mover. The service is to consist in spiritual worship, not to be taught through a priest, hence not ritual. And there is to be abundant provision for forgiveness. These ideals receive such treatment that Messianic prophecy develops into a system. The Davidic prophecies concerned the future of the kingdom of God. No failure on the part of the people had as yet appeared to show the impracticable nature of the form of things then existing. Those prophecies had been scattered and unsystematic. But as the literary prophets take up the theme of the future renovation and reorganization of the kingdom of God, they bind all prophecy of it into a compact system.

The ideal may be briefly sketched as follows :

1. *External relations.* An underlying thought of Old Testament prophecy is the antagonism between the society of men by whom the true God is served and worshiped, and the societies of men which constitute world-kingsdoms. Egypt and Assyria are the kingdoms distinctly represented as symbolizing the world-powers. These kingdoms, especially Assyria, were punishers of Israel, used by Yahweh to discipline his rebellious people; yet they were liable to be defeated

when victory seemed most certain, whereby the power and glory of Yahweh were revealed upon them. Pre-eminently the Assyrian kingdom exhibits that kind of a kingdom which at all times is antagonistic to the kingdom of God. On the other hand, the endurance of the society of God in the face of all opposition, winning success in spite of the world powers, is a frequent theme of Messianic prophecy. God is righteous; his will moves steadily and irresistibly toward its end. It is not a blind necessity; hence those who work for God's will must work righteously. Herein lay the reason that the world-powers were at any moment liable to be checked or cast aside.

2. *The day of Yahweh.* This was the crisis which should usher in the new era of the kingdom of God. The opposition of world-kingdoms and the wickedness of men are to become more open and stronger in defiance of God's will. The righteous will of God will reveal itself more fully until at last, in full consummation, it shall destroy every vestige of opposition in some climax of judgment. Two lines of prophecy point to this day so far as Israel is concerned. Israel is to be sifted, sinners are to be destroyed, a righteous remnant is to be saved. Again, Israel is to be converted, humbled, brought to repentance by God's chastisements, and renewed by his Spirit. When this aim has been accomplished the wicked, who have been God's unconscious and self-seeking instruments, will be cast aside and destroyed.

3. *Character.* The subjects of the kingdom shall be fit company for God, and a more intimate relation than ever shall be established on the basis of a better covenant. The preaching of grace was not without ethical character. God's blessing would surely come, but a part of the blessing was in securing righteous character.

4. *Extent.* This future kingdom was to be universal. It was to be a world-wide commonwealth, with its center at Zion. A universal brotherhood was to worship God, who was to be made known by the missionary activity of Israel. In its accomplishment this idea has been at once a stumbling-block and a mighty proof of Christianity.

5. *Ruler.* Thus far the Messianic prophecies in the broad sense. From one point of view, Messianic prophecy was a development. The general promise of blessing to Israel and then through Israel was first conceived as having reference to temporal prosperity; was later regarded as requiring a ruler who should represent Yahweh and defend Israel from enemies; later he was expected to secure righteous conduct and true worship; still later appears the idea that he should secure their safety by his own peril and suffering, and finally should mediate in worship between them and God. The ruler is represented as a king of an earthly royal line, that of David. Yet at the same time the king is often Yahweh himself.

With such ideals of the kingdom of God, wrought out on the basis of divine grace and promise, and on the ruins of human failure, the Old Testaments finished their work. For Israel at the close of Old Testament history the kingdom of God had a past and a future, but no present.

MUST WE FOLLOW THE NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION OF OLD TESTAMENT TEXTS?

BY PROF. FRANZ DELITZSCH,*

Leipzig, Germany.

The New Testament is the key to the Old, and the citations of the Old Testament in the New are the norm according to which the Christian interpretation must use these keys of knowledge (cf. Luke XI. 52). These citations, however, are not specimens of the art of grammatico-historical exegesis, but illustrations of prophecy by the history of its fulfillment. The apostles determine the meaning of the Scriptures, not according to the consciousness of the Old Testament writers, but according to the meaning of the *Holy Spirit*, who passes into them, as the one "*auctor primarius*" (cf. Heb. III. 7).

1. Without the New Testament, the Old Testament would be a labyrinth without a clue, a syllogism without a conclusion, a riddle without a solution, a torso without a head, a moon without a sun, since Christ is the proper interpreter of the Old Testament.

2. The New Testament writers presuppose that not merely this or that passage in the Old Testament is a prophecy looking to the New Testament, but that the *whole* is a prophecy of the New. Jesus is the fulfilling of the law and the prophets (Matt. v. 17); he is the "end of the law" (Rom. x. 4). The history of the Old Testament, the cultus of the Old Testament and the prophecy of the Old Testament—all look to him as their goal.

3. The New Testament writers presuppose that prophecy, both verbal and typical, is essentially one. Therefore, for example, Matthew cites the saying of Hosea XI. 1, as a prophecy, just as readily as the saying of Isaiah VII. 14.

4. The New Testament writers presuppose that in Jesus is fulfilled not only the coming of the second David, but also the *parousia* of Jehovah which is foretold in the Old Testament. Therefore the Epistle to the Hebrews refers Psalm CII. 26-28 directly to Christ, as the "*kurios*" whose appearing the Psalmist prays for, as ensuring the restoration of Zion and the perfecting of the kingdom of God.

5. The New Testament writers presuppose that already in the Old Testament the idea of the coming Christ is found as well in the history of Israel (Heb. XI. 26; 1 Cor. x. 4) as in the word of the Old Testament. Hence he speaks through the prophets announcing himself (Heb. II. 13); he speaks by David (Heb. II. 12; x. 5 seq.; John xv. 25; XIII. 18); also through Asaph (Matt. XIII. 25); and he speaks also in the Imprecatory Psalms (Rom. XI. 9 seq.).

6. The New Testament writers presuppose that the Septuagint translation is fitted to give a sufficiently true representation of the word of God in the Old Testament. This translation was then, among the Hellenistic Jews, the "*versio accepta*." The Babylonian Talmud relates the legend of its miraculous origin; hence the New Testament writers usually cite the Old Testament according to

* These statements were made by Prof. Delitzsch at a meeting of American students in Leipzig; they were taken down and translated by the Rev. W. S. Bean, Florence, S. C.

this translation, even when it does not correspond exactly with the original text. In this they accommodate themselves to their time.

7. The New Testament writers follow in their views of the Old Testament, so far as possible, the received tradition. The Lord himself uses an argument against the Pharisees "*a concessis*," viz., Ps. cx. Paul, also, in Rom. ix. 25; x. 20 seq., uses the words of Hosea and Isaiah in relation to the heathen. The grammatico-historical exegesis is not bound strictly to follow him in this.

It must be remembered that the New Testament writers do not always *cite* the Old Testament when they use it. They employ its language frequently as fitting expressions of New Testament facts (e. g. Rom. x. 18 from Ps. xix. 5) without explaining the prophecy thereby. So we are not warranted in concluding from Eph. iv. 26, that *rigezu*, in Ps. iv. 5, is to be translated by *'opuzēiv*.

In conclusion, the presuppositions of the New Testament citations are the norm of the Christian view of the Old Testament history and scripture, but in particulars, the scientific exposition of the Old Testament is not slavishly bound by the apostolic writings.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

NOV. 14. PETER RESTORED. John XXI. 4-19.

NOV. 21. WALKING IN THE LIGHT. 1 John I.—II. 6.

NOV. 28. JOHN'S VISION OF CHRIST. Rev. I. 4-18.

DEC. 5. WORSHIPING GOD AND THE LAMB. Rev. v. 1-14.

DEC. 12. THE SAINTS IN HEAVEN. Rev. VII. 9-17.

DEC. 19. THE GREAT INVITATION. Rev. XXII. 8-21.

For this month we consider the remaining lessons from the New Testament, that we may have the whole space, in the next issue, for the Book of Genesis and the lessons from the Old Testament.

The last five of the lessons under consideration were evidently intended by the committee that selected them to cover the writings commonly attributed to the Apostle John, outside the Gospel of John. The three Epistles of John have, perhaps, a shorter line of contact with the Old Testament than has any other part of the New Testament of equal length. Westcott and Hort do not recognize so much as one word in the three as of Old Testament origin, and therefore to be printed in uncial letters. Even these books, however, are not independent of the Old Testament; witness the illustration from the story of Cain and his brother, 1 John III. 12, and other equally marked instances.

The relations of the Book of Revelation to the Old Testament are quite peculiar. They are well represented by the fact that Professor Toy, in his book on the New Testament quotations from the Old, does not recognize in the Book of Revelation a single formal citation, but mentions a hundred and fifty-six instances of allusion, including, probably, double that number of specifications. The same fact is presented to the eye in the Westcott and Hort text, where the

words and phrases in uncial characters are scattered thickly on every page, while the instances in which a phrase in uncials exceeds a single line are comparatively few. If to these allusions to Old Testament phraseology we add the separate allusions to Old Testament facts (the names of the tribes in Rev. vii., for example) we shall have nearly as many recognitions of the Old Testament, in the Book of Revelation, as there are verses in the book; and this although the Book of Revelation does not once mention "the Scriptures" or "the Law" by those names, or use the formula "it is written" for introducing a citation from them. The instance is of especial value for use in certain parallel cases in Old Testament criticism,—for example, in the case of the testimony of the Books of Judges and Samuel to the Hexateuch.

The use thus made of the Old Testament in this book is well enough illustrated if we begin with Rev. i. 5. In this verse "the faithful witness" is from Ps. LXXXIX. 37 (38). The "firstborn," the "chief one of the kings of the earth" is from the same Psalm, verse 27 (28). Read that Psalm, verses 19-37, and it will fill this verse in Revelation full of meaning. "A kingdom, priests to God," verse six, goes back to the expression "ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests," Exod. XIX. 6. So verse seven combines the phraseology of Dan. vii. 13 with that of Zech. XII. 10-14; and so on, verse after verse. The new Jerusalem of the Revelator, lighted by the glory of God, having no need of sun or moon, with gates that never close, where God wipes away tears from all faces, takes a large proportion of its most striking peculiarities from different chapters of Isaiah. In the symbolic imagery it employs, wonderfully clad men, strange living creatures, horses, angels, written rolls, the Book of Revelation has unmistakable affinities with the Books of Ezechiel, Daniel, and Zechariah.

The Books of Daniel and of Revelation belong to a class of literature known as the *apocalyptic* books. Outside the canon, a considerable number of such books were produced by Jewish authors, within a few generations before and after Jesus. Perhaps the best known of these, at present, are the Book of Enoch and the so-called apocryphal book of Second Esdras. One who is studying the literary character of the apocalyptic books of the Bible should read with them several of these uncanonical apocalyptic books. He would find the comparison instructive, both by reason of the resemblances between the books, and by reason of their contrasts.

CHAPTER-STUDY: JACOB'S BLESSING (GEN. XLIX.).

BY THE EDITOR.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. What has been done in former numbers of THE STUDENT for certain "Books" of the Bible, it is proposed now to do for certain "Chapters." As before, the aim in view is (1) the acquisition of *real* Bible-knowledge, (2) the cultivation of an historical spirit, (3) the attainment of a habit of independent investigation.

2. This work, if thoroughly done, will accomplish directly two things: (1) it will give the student a clearer and deeper knowledge of the particular chapter

studied; (2) it will furnish him a "method," and at the same time train him in it, which may be employed, with necessary variations, in future study.

3. Those chapters will be chosen which are generally recognized to be *representative* chapters. They will be chapters (1) of great historical scope, (2) of important theological significance, (3) demanding, in their interpretation, the application of all the leading hermeneutical principles, (4) containing a large amount of the prophetic element, (5) presenting many difficulties, (6) to be mastered only by long and hard study, (7) neglected, for the most part, except by specialists.

4. In successive "Chapter-studies," alternating with "Book-studies," we shall take up Genesis XLIX., Exodus XV., Deuteronomy XXXII., Deuteronomy XXXIII. For those who are able to make use of the Hebrew, there will be published in HEBRAICA (beginning with the January number), linguistic and critical notes upon these chapters.

5. For aids, the student is referred to the various commentaries on this chapter, and to the articles in Smith's *Bible Dictionary* on the topics suggested.

II. DIRECTIONS.

1. Undertake the *mastery* of the chapter. A general knowledge of the passage is needed before the interpretation of individual verses can be taken up with profit. In this, proceed as follows:—

- a. Read several times, in the Revised Version, the entire chapter.
- b. Compare carefully with the Revised Version, the AV., and write out in parallel columns the variations, distinguishing in some way those changes in the RV., which seem to be important, from those which are evidently unimportant.
- c. Compare closely the marginal readings of the RV., having in mind the fact that, in the majority of instances, the "margin" contains the better reading.
- d. Take up the "tribes" in the order mentioned, and write in columns the various statements made concerning each, e. g.,

Simeon and Levi:—

- (1) They are brethren.
- (2) Their swords are weapons of violence.
- (3) My soul shall not come into their council.
- (4) They slew men and hamstring oxen.
- (5) Their anger shall be cursed.
- (6) They shall be scattered in Israel.

Judah:—

- (1) Shall be praised by his brethren.
- (2) His hand shall be on the neck of his enemies.
- (3) Is a lion's whelp; has gone up from the prey; has couched as a lion; as a lioness, who shall arouse him?
- (4) Shall not lose the sceptre until he come to Shiloh (or, until Shiloh come).
- (5) Shall receive the obedience of peoples.
- (6) Shall bind colts to the choicest vines.
- (7) Shall wash his garments in wine.
- (8) Shall have eyes red with wine, and teeth white with milk.

- e. Study the detailed analyses until every statement concerning each tribe is definitely fixed in mind.

2. Undertake now the interpretation of those detailed statements in the chapter, which, at first sight, do not seem clear. In this work make use of such helps as you can command. It must be remembered that, until a pretty definite idea of the authorship, date, scope, aim, etc.,* of the chapter has been obtained, it will not be possible to settle exactly the force of these statements. This general standpoint from which every thing must be considered, cannot, however, be secured until there has first been made a critical examination of the details.† Proceed as follows:—

- a. Read carefully Genesis XLVIII., which contains an account of the blessing of Manasseh and Ephraim by Jacob.
- b. Study the introductory verse of chapter XLIX., and decide upon the force to be attached to the phrase "in the latter days."
- c. Note the order in which the several tribes are taken up; read the narrative of the birth of Jacob's sons (Gen. XXIX. 31—XXX. 24); learn the meaning of the name of each tribe.
- d. Ascertain the events alluded to in (1) "because thou wentest up to thy father's bed" (verse 4); and (2) "for in their anger they slew a man" (v. 6).
- e. Look up the individual history of Judah and Joseph; study their personal characteristics, and the basis furnished by these characteristics for the words here spoken concerning them.
- f. Study the historical events centering in "Shiloh;" the position and history of Zidon; and such geographical allusions as are contained in "between the sheep-folds" (v. 14), "a serpent in the way" (v. 17), etc.
- g. Inquire into the following archaeological topics: (1) the special rights of the first-born; (2) the practice of hamstringing cattle; (3) the use and significance of the staff; (4) meaning of the most common words for wine, and the cultivation of the vine; (5) Israel's relation to Phœnicia; (6) the ass; (7) the hind; (8) venomous serpents; (9) the wolf; (10) the Nazarite (perhaps alluded to in verse 26).
- h. Ascertain the meaning of the following expressions in their several connections:—(1) "beginning of my strength" (v. 3); (2) "excellency of dignity" (v. 3); (3) "come not into their council" (v. 6); (4) "my glory" (v. 6); (5) "saw a resting-place that it was good" (v. 15); (6) "a servant under task-work" (v. 16); (7) "as one of the tribes of Israel" (v. 16); (8) "he giveth goodly words" (v. 21); (9) "archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him" etc. (v. 23); (10) "that was separate from his brethren" (v. 26).
- i. In the case of the following rhetorical figures ascertain the basis of comparison, and express in literal language the full force of the expression,—(1) "bubbling over as water" (v. 4); (2) "hand on the neck of enemies" (v. 8); (3) "Judah is a lion's whelp" (v. 9); (4) "from the prey . . . gone up" (v. 9); (5) "he couched as a lion" (v. 9); (6) "as a lioness" (v. 9); (7) "ruler's staff from between his feet" (v. 10); (8) "binding his foal to the vine" (v. 11); (9) "washed his garments in wine" (v. 11); (10) "eyes red with wine" (v. 12); (11) "teeth white with milk" (v. 12); (12) "Issachar is a strong ass" (v. 14); (13) "couching down between the sheep-

* The consideration of these points is taken up farther along in the "study."

† One must, therefore, study each detail mentioned in the chapter, in order to ascertain the authorship, date, scope, aim, etc., of the book; and, after a conclusion has been reached, study again the same details in the light of this conclusion.

folds" (v. 14); (14) "bowed his shoulder to hear" (v. 15); (15) "Dan a serpent in the way" (v. 17); (16) "and biteth the horses' heels." (v. 17); (17) "a troop shall press upon him" (v. 19); (18) "he shall press upon their heel" (v. 19); (19) "his bread shall be fat" (v. 20); (20) "Naphtali is a hind let loose" (v. 21); (21) "Joseph is a fruitful bough" (v. 22); (22) "his branches run over the wall" (v. 22); (23) "archers have sorely grieved him" (v. 23); (24) "his bow abode in strength" (v. 24); (25) "the stone of Israel" (v. 24); (26) "blessings of the ancient mountains" (v. 26); (27) "Benjamin is a wolf that raveneth" (v. 27).

j. Notice carefully the following special difficulties:—

- (1) The connection and meaning of verse 18.
- (2) The force and significance of the parenthetical line in verse 24, "from thence is the shepherd," etc.
- (3) The logical relation existing between verses 24, 25, 26.

k. Study the concluding verses (28-33) of the chapter.

3. Having now mastered the statements of the chapter, and, so far as possible, learned their meaning, let us put them together with a view to obtaining a conception of the chapter as a whole in the various aspects in which it must be regarded:—

a. Procure a large sheet of heavy paper or card-board, and draw lines dividing it into four sections:

- (1) In the first section, write a brief literal statement of the writer's words concerning each tribe.
- (2) In the second section, write side by side with the former statement the substance of the parallel statement made by the writer of Deut. XXXIII.
- (3) In the third section, write a brief statement containing the leading details of the later history of each tribe, so far as it can be ascertained.
- (4) In the fourth section, describe the territory occupied by each tribe.

b. Study the chart thus constructed, comparing the material in the various sections concerning each tribe; note the resemblances and the differences.

c. Consider the following special points:—

- (1) The curse here (v. 7) pronounced on Levi, as compared with the blessing in Deut. XXXIII. 8-11; and further, the Mosaic enactments concerning the Levites as compared with the facts of history given in Scripture.
- (2) The "Shiloh" prophecy: (a) variations of the text found in MSS. and presupposed in Ancient Versions;* (b) the translations of the Ancient Versions; (c) the interpretation which regards the word as an abstract noun; (d) the interpretation of it as the name of a person; (e) the interpretation as the name of a place; (f) the arguments and authority for and against each of the following renderings:—(a) *he who shall be sent*, (β) *his son*, (γ) *Peacemaker*, (δ) *until Shiloh come*, (ε) *he whose right it is*, (ζ) *tranquility*, (η) *until he come to Shiloh*; (g) the arguments and authority for and against a Messianic interpretation.

d. Study the place of Genesis XLIX. in prophecy:—

- (1) What prophecies precede and follow this?
- (2) Fundamental differences between Gen. XLIX. and Deut. XXXIII.:—(a) one patriarchal, and the other national; (b) one shaped by parallel be-

* Any good commentary will indicate these variations and the translations of the Ancient Versions.

- tween Judah and Joseph, the other by that between Levi and Joseph; (c) other differences; (d) explanation of these.
- (3) Is this chapter really a "blessing"? or is it not rather a curse, at least in the cases of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Zebulun, Issachar, Dan, Benjamin? What considerations favor the former view?
 - (4) The point of departure of the patriarch's vision; the ground-work of the prophecy:—(a) the natural character of the twelve sons; (b) the divine promise already given to the patriarchs (what did this include?).
 - (5) The perspective of the prophecy; the time in the nation's history to which its fullness may be assigned: (a) usage of "in the latter days"? (b) how far down did the prophet see? (c) absence of any references to Joshua's work, or to any distinct historical event.
 - (6) Analogous cases: (a) the belief of the ancients concerning the words of dying men; (b) words of Isaac (Gen. xxxvii.), of Moses (Deut. xxxii.), of Joshua (Josh. xxiv.), of Samuel (1 Sam. xii.), of David (2 Sam. xxiii.); (c) of New Testament characters; (d) bearing of all this on the case in hand.
- e. Study the poetical character of the chapter:—
- (1) Take up the particular verses, and classify the members, as they are indicated in the RV., according to their character as synonymous, antithetic, synthetic.*
 - (2) Indicate, so far as you are able, instances of the various characteristics of Hebrew poetry:† (a) occurrence of rare words; (b) archaic forms; (c) elliptical constructions; (d) cases of paronomasia, or play upon words; (e) rhetorical figures; (f) rhythm.
- f. Consider now the origin and date of the poem:—
- (1) The direct statements in the poem itself.
 - (2) The evidence contained in the poem of the truthfulness of these statements.
 - (3) If later than the time given, to what age may it be assigned?
 - (4) Difficulties in the way of assigning it to a later date: (a) the very indefiniteness which characterizes the poem; (b) the fact that, *if* later, it would seem to be a forgery; (c) no satisfactory date to which to assign it; (d) absence of any mention of the appointment of Levi to the priesthood.
 - (5) Is this poem assigned by those who accept the composite authorship of Genesis to the "Jehovistic" or to the "Elohistic" writer?
 - (6) The chief ground upon which certain critics assign it to a later date.
 - (7) The views of the leading writers.
- g. Review the entire poem, understanding that it is the work of a late writer, perhaps Nathan, but placed in the mouth of Jacob, and written so as to seem adapted to his age and circumstances.
- h. Again read the poem, endeavoring to recall in connection with each verse all the results of your work upon that verse, understanding, however, that, at least for substance, it goes back to the patriarch Jacob.

* For information concerning the various kinds of parallelism, see *Smith's Bible Dictionary* Art. *Hebrew Poetry*.

† This can be done only upon the basis of the original text.

COMMENTARIES ON EXODUS.

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN, D. D.,

Union Theol. Seminary, New York.

1. CHARACTERIZATION OF COMMENTARIES.

The main design of this paper is to characterize in few words those commentaries on the Book of Exodus which students will find most frequently referred to in exegetical works. Even within these limits, no attempt is made at completeness. The older commentaries of a more popular cast, such as Matthew Henry's, and the like, works on Old Testament history, and monographs on such topics as the Exodus itself, the legislation at Sinai, etc., as well as all books on authorship and structure, are excluded from consideration here. As an encouragement to exact bibliography, the titles of the books mentioned are given at some length, but are appended to the article, to avoid too great disfigurement of the successive pages.

From *Origen*, who may serve to illustrate the patristic exegesis, there have come down to us three distinct sorts of comment on Exodus. His characteristic is to interpret symbolically. Of historical exegesis, i. e., a definite purpose of trying to understand exactly what the original writer, amid the surroundings of his time and place, intended to say, there is very little. He recognizes the existence of such a meaning, but does not rest contented with it, and makes the allegorical meaning much more prominent. Mysticism prevails throughout. Origen is, however, important as a witness to the Old Testament text of his time.

Mystical and symbolic interpretations were characteristic of the mediæval exegesis; and it is worth while to notice only a few of the Jewish commentators of that period, who at least had some knowledge of Hebrew. The most important of these were *Rashi*, *Aben Ezra*, *Qimchi* and *Abarbanel*. Of these, *Qimchi* was prominent as grammarian and lexicographer; *Aben Ezra* noteworthy for his objective, historical method, and sound sense; *Abarbanel* for keenness and style; but *Rashi*, more rabbinical and traditional, probably exerted the greatest influence on exegesis in his own and the immediately succeeding ages. These general remarks apply to their comments on Exodus.

Calm, who wrote a commentary on Genesis as a separate book, combined the other four books of the Pentateuch into a kind of harmony, and expounded them accordingly. The work is done with firmness, precision and insight, and with especial care in guarding against mystical conceits. He came out clearly against the whole school of which Origen was so marked a representative. Historical, scientific, objective exegesis marks his comments on the Pentateuch, as well as his other exegetical work. He was a good Hebrew scholar, and did not hesitate to follow Jewish interpreters, if they seemed right; but his attitude toward them was independent and critical.

Ainsworth's Annotations were among the first of the great eclectic commentaries. He drew from various sources, and combined his materials with great care and skill. His treatment of word-usage is excellent. He had a broad conception of the exegete's duty; evidenced, e. g., by the metrical version of Exod. xv.,

which he incorporates, prefixing some bars of music, with the remark, "This may be sung also as the 113 Psalm."

Grotius, of Holland, was like Calvin in his scientific view of the sphere of exegesis, but more free in his attitude towards the Scriptures, and particularly in his view of inspiration. His comments are brief notes, incomplete, but easily grasped, and hence widely used and quoted. He could, however, discuss important matters at length. His treatise on the Decalogue (Amsterdam, 1642, cf. *Critici Sacri*) is famous. He held to the Arminian party (cf. also *Critici Sacri*).

Rivet was a Dutch exegete, like Grotius. His commentary is fuller, especially in matters of grammatical construction, where he is sometimes pedantic. He belonged to the moderate wing of the Reformed Church, and was an industrious and careful scholar,—not brilliant, or especially profound, but sensible and worthy of respect.

Cartwright's notes on Exodus were based upon Jewish authorities, often thoroughly digested and accurately judged. His work had some popularity, and was among the tokens of the great movement in England, in the 17th century, toward a wider as well as deeper acquaintance with the Bible. It furnished a considerable part of the notes on Exodus in the *Supplementum Crit. Sacr.* (cf. *Critici Sacri*). It was, however, a good deal overshadowed by Poole's great work.

Matthew Poole's Synopsis is a work of vast industry. It is compiled from Jewish and Christian authorities, and forms a great store-house of comments, verbal and other. Its frequent re-issue, notwithstanding the bulk of the volumes, testifies to its sterling worth. The student who desires to gain some idea of the early history of the exegesis of the Book of Exodus cannot do better than to read what Poole has collected, on at least a few chapters.

A work on a similar plan is the collection *Criticorum Sacrorum* (or *Critici Sacri*); but this does not cover so wide a range.

Clericus (*le Clerc*), of Geneva, but Dutch by adoption, was a worthy follower of Grotius, whom indeed he excelled in philological training. He was a brilliant scholar, often radical in his views, much criticised and opposed, and frequently with reason, but himself a keen critic, and an exegete of grasp and force.

Bishop *Patrick's* work is the product of learning, moderate temper and a practical purpose; was widely used by English readers, and not really superseded until the present century.

J. H. Michaelis collected critical notes of various sorts on the margins of his edition of the Hebrew Bible, showing diligence and high scholarship, but much condensed, and printed, from the necessity of the case, in type too fine to be serviceable.

J. D. Michaelis was more of an exegete, and indeed a man of very great and varied learning. He studied the text with care and from many points of view; philology, dogmatics, geography, natural science, travels, were all laid under contribution. His attitude is conservative, but not reactionary. At some points he holds a mediating position between extreme views.

Houbigant's notes had some currency, especially among Roman Catholics, though not in themselves of profound importance. His learning was not always thorough, and his critical principles, though conservative, were arbitrary.

Smits was another of the same stamp, not possessed of great originality, but conscientious and diligent.

Dathe chiefly philological and grammatical. His notes are very brief and somewhat lifeless.

Geddes' book is chiefly noteworthy for the view as to the structure of the Pentateuch (called the "Fragmentary Hypothesis") set forth in its preface, and illustrated in the divisions of the text, and the notes.

Rosenmüller brought together a much more abundant mass of materials than any of his predecessors, and it is chiefly on this account, and by reason of sobriety and good sense in presenting and combining them, that his work retains value. The student can derive from it more knowledge of the older exegetical sources, and the proper way of using them, than from any previous work. Except for tracing the history of exegesis, it is not often worth while to go back of *Rosenmüller*.

Vater's Commentary, though ignoring too much the religious significance of the Hebrew history, brought out into clear light the human element in the Scripture. This was a service, in spite of the extreme to which this and his critical views (he was the German champion of the "fragmentary hypothesis" in regard to the Pentateuch) led him. In details he is clear and not uncandid. Sometimes his judgment is excellent, but the work is not even. It has not the permanent value of *Rosenmüller*.

Maurer followed in the lines of *Rosenmüller*, and exhibited industry and judgment, without, however, displacing *Rosenmüller* at all. His work is much briefer than *Rosenmüller's*, but his opinion, wherever it is fully and independently expressed, is entitled to consideration.

Bush called into service the preceding commentators and compilers, down to *Rosenmüller*, and produced a very creditable and useful book. Nothing, since *Patriek*, had appeared in English which was so well adapted to English-speaking students of the Bible. Even now, there is nothing else in English which does equal justice to the English Bible-scholars of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Baumgarten was too much under the influence of subjective notions. His commentary reads ideas into the text which no sober exegesis could derive from it. There is a religiosity about the work that renders it practically worthless as an exposition.

With *Kalisch* we reach quite a different type. He endeavors to give the exact meaning of the original, and discusses doubtful matters with independence. He makes considerable use of Jewish commentaries, but does not follow them blindly. His opinion is generally well-supported by argument. He made his book cumbersome and expensive by including in it a Hebrew text and translation, and enlarged it needlessly by being prolix at some points. It deserves, however, more attention than it often receives, as a vigorous attempt to combine reverence for Scripture with scientific boldness.

In *Bunsen* we find the same spirit. He does not go so minutely into grammatical discussion,—indeed his notes are avowedly for the general reader,—but his conception of the exegete's work is a large one, and his tone stimulating. He desired to bridge the chasm between scientific exegesis and the currents of popular thought, by ranging exegesis among the other sciences, and also by making them tributary to it. The attitude is independent and consciously chosen. The author's enthusiasm, profound feeling—not always equaled by his exact scholarship—and his earnest moral purpose give dignity to the work; but the arrangement is perplexing, and as a student's commentary it is inadequate.

Keil has several of the qualities that make a good exegete. Even in this day, when Hebrew attainments are judged by a very different standard from that of a generation ago, he holds a respectable position as grammatical interpreter. He is patient and careful, without being too diffuse. He does not easily lose his head. He tries to be fair to his opponents. He has the practical skill which comes from long experience in exegetical work. His temper is too apologetic, however, to enable him to judge delicate questions without prejudice. He lacks acute perception, and fails, often, to understand the difficulties which perplex others. He does not grasp the important, central matter of interpretation with sufficient vigor. In his conscientious devotion to each detail, there is a loss of perspective. He stands as a conservative champion, but it is rather because he is unimpressible than because he is really master of the situation. The English translation of his commentary on Exodus is rather out of date, yet, notwithstanding these drawbacks, there is nothing better in English.

Wordsworth is like Keil in being strongly, even timorously conservative, and his short notes would not be a substitute for a more extended and thorough commentary, even if he inclined less than he does to patristic, mythical interpretations.

Murphy is rather a philosopher and dogmatician than an exegete. His compact and positive statements are effective, but the method is not a good one. Too much prominence, relatively, is given to the religious and theological significance of the passages discussed, and too little to their primary meaning. From the point of view adopted, however, the work is a manly and vigorous one.

Jacobus' book is on much the same plan with Bush's,—having the advantage of some new exegetical works that had appeared since 1841. Jacobus, however, was not, like Bush, a professed Orientalist.

Lange's Commentary endeavors to join exegetical scholarship with practical edification. Sometimes the two are a little too much mixed. Lange has an abundance of expository thought, but is diffuse, and often fails in perspicuity. There are some careful notes by the American editor.

The "*Speaker's Commentary*" is, like most commentaries from many hands, of very uneven quality. The volume on the Pentateuch is among the better parts of it. It attempts, like Lange's work, to combine the popular and the scholarly; but the former preponderates. Opinions are too often advanced without reasons, and reasons assigned are too often inadequate. There is frequent hesitancy in giving an opinion. As the chief guide in studying Exodus it is unsatisfactory. The historical, geographical and archaeological remarks on Exodus are not without value, and the Excursus on Egypt and the Pentateuch are interesting. The tendency is, however, to exaggerate Egyptian influence in the life and language of the Hebrews. There are some wood-cut maps of the Exodus, Sinai, etc.

Reuss's notes, accompanying his translation of the Bible, are short and few, but incisive, and always worthy of regard. Occasionally they show the radical views of the author.

Dillmann's Commentary is the best yet published on Exodus. He is a thorough Hebrew scholar, and as an exegete painstaking, tireless, watchful, with a clear and cool judgment. He aims at simple fidelity to the original. His work is a model of distinctness and condensation. Originally prepared by Knobel, and still retaining whole sentences and paragraphs from Knobel's hand, it has become, under Dillmann's editorship, a substantially new book. Attention is paid to all

the chief expositors, so that, in the briefest form, but accurately, the student is introduced to the history of the exegesis of the passage in hand. The author is, however, not overwhelmed by his materials. His own incisive opinion makes itself clearly heard. His critical position is intermediate between the extreme conservatism of Keil and the ultra-radicalism of Wellhausen.

Ellicott's Old Testament Commentary is for popular use, and is named here because of the reputation of Rawlinson, who writes on Exodus. Rawlinson has slightly freer scope in

The Pulpit Commentary, although the mass of homiletic matter that fills the volume not only makes it unwieldy, but tends to overshadow the exegetical features of it. Rawlinson is a patient and faithful student, somewhat like Keil in temper, though not his equal as a Hebraist. Neither is he as thorough. He is at his best when he is combining the results gained by others into an attractive historical picture. To exegetical processes his endowments and habits are less adapted.

What *Ginsburg's* and *Macgregor's* Commentaries will be can only be inferred from what is known of the men and from the scope of the series in which their books are announced. There is certainly still room for a good commentary on Exodus, in English.

II. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF COMMENTARIES.

ORIGEN.—(1) *Fragm. tria. Ex Origenis Comm. in Exodum* (at least two vols. originally.) Migne. (Gr. and Lat.) Or. 2., 263-282. (2) *Ex Origene Selecta in Exodum* ("quae sub Origenis nomine in ceteris Graecis manuscriptis circumferuntur"). Id. Ib. 281-298. (Gr. and Lat.) (3) *Homiliae Origenis in Exodum.* (Lat. of Rufinus.) Id. Ib. 297-306. XIII Homilies.

RASHI.—*Rabbi Salomo ben Isaac*, רש"י (1040-1105). Commentary (not on Chron., Ezra, Nehem.) in Rabbin. Bibles, since 1546-8. Best ed.: A. Berliner: *Rashii* (Salomonis Isaacidis) in Pentateuchum commentarius. Berlin, 1866. Comm. in Lat. trans. (Joh. Friedr. Breithaupt); 3 vols. 4to. Gotha, 1710-14. — Germ. trans. (L. Dukes), in *חומש' תורה*, etc. 5 vols. Prague, 1833-38.

IRN EZRA.—*Abraham ben Meir ben (ilm) Ezra.* Comm. on Pentateuch. 1152-53.

QIMCHI.—*David (ben Joseph) Qimchi* (Qamehi, Kimchi) (1160-1235). Comm. in Rabbin. Bibles, etc.

ARABANEL (ABRAYANEL).—*Isaac (ben Jehuda) Abravanel*, 1437-1508. Comm. on Pentateuch. Venice, 1579, and Hanau, 1710.

(See on above, Strack, in *Lehrbuch der Neuhebräischen Sprache u. Literatur*, von Herm. L. Strack u. Carl Siegfried. Karlsruhe u. Leipzig. 1884. pp. 111, 113. See also Rabbinical Bibles; and J. G. Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraea*. Also *Crit. Sacr.*, and Poole's *Synopsis*.)

CALVIN.—*Mosis Libri V. cum Johannis Calvini Commentariis.* Genesis seorsum; reliqui quatuor in formam harmoniae digesti. Geneva. 1563. [1 vol.]

Various editions since. The best are the following:—

Corpus Reformatorum Volumen LII. Joannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia. Ediderunt Gulielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, Eduardus Reuss, Theologi Argentoratenses. Volumen xxiv. Braunshweig. 1882.

(Sub-titles are:—*Joannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia. Ad Fidem Editionum Principum et Authenticarum ex Parte etiam Codicum Manu Scriptorum. Additis Prolegomenis Literariis, Annotationibus Criticis, Annalibus Calvinianis, Indicibusque Novis et Copiosissimis* Ediderunt Gulielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, Eduardus Reuss, Theologi Argentoratenses,

And

Joannis Calvini Opera Exegetica et Homiletica ad Fidem Editionum Authenticarum cum Prolegomenis Literariis Annotationibus Criticis et Indicibus Ediderunt Eduardus Cunitz, Eduardus Reuss, Paulus Lobstein, Theologi Argentoratenses. Vol. II.)

Also, *Id.*, Vol. LIII. (Calv. Op. xxv.)

[The Comm. on Exod. is not continuous; an Index to the passages is given, Vol. LIII. (xxv.), pp. 406, 407]

Eng. Trans.—Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, arranged in the form of a Harmony. By *John Calvin*. Translated from the original Latin, and compared with the French edition; with Annotations, etc. By the Rev. Charles William Bingham, M. A., Rector of Mel-

combe-Horsey, Dorset, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. 4 vols. Calvin Translation Soc., Edinburgh. 1852-55.

AINSWORTH.—Annotations upon the Five Bookes of Moses, the Booke of the Psalmes, and the Song of Songs, or Canticles. Wherein the Hebrew Words and Sentences are compared with and explained by the ancient Greek and Chaldee Versions, and other Records and Monuments of the Hebrews: But chiefly by conference with the Holy Scriptures, Moses his Words, Lawes and Ordinances, the Sacrifices, and other legall Ceremonies heretofore commanded by God to the Church of Israel, are explained. With an Advertisement touching some Objections made against the sinceritie of the Hebrew Text, and allegation of the Rabbines in these Annotations. As also, Tables directing unto such principall things as are observed in the Annotations upon each severall Booke. By *Henry Ainsworth*. London [1627], 1639. Sub-title: Annotations upon the Second Booke of Moses, called Exodus: Wherein, by conferring the Holy Scriptures, comparing the Chaldee and Greek Versions, and other Records of the Hebrews, Moses his Words, Lawes and Ordinances, are explained. By *Henry Ainsworth*. London, 1639. Pp. 156. [Latest edition of whole work, Edinburgh, 1843. 2 vols.]

GROTIUS.—*Hugonis Grotii* Annotata ad Vetus Testamentum. Tomus I. Pp. vi, 560. Paris. 1644. [Whole in 3 vols., 1644. Vol. I. cont. Gen.—Cant., and Lam. Exodus fills pp. 56-86.]

Re-edited as follows:—

Hugonis Grotii Annotationes in Vetus Testamentum emendatius edidit, et Brevibus Complurium Locorum Dilucidationibus auxit Georgius Joannes Ludov. Vogel, Philos. in Reg. Frider. Prof. Publ. Tomus I. Pp. [viii], 462. Halle. 1775. [Whole in 3 vols., 1775-76, ed. Vogel and Döderlein. Vol. I. contains Gen.—Cant., and Lam. Exodus fills pp. 55-111.]

RIVET.—*Andreae Riveti* Pietavi Summaxentini. SS. Theologiae Doctoris & Professoris Opera Theologica. Partim Exegetica, partim Didactica, partim Polemica.—*Andreae Riveti* Pietavi Summaxentini, SS. Theologiae Doctoris, & Sacrorum Literarum Celeberrima Lugdunensi Butavorum Academia olim Professoris, Operum Theologicorum quae Latine edidit. Tomus Primus Exegeticus: Continens, Exercitationes in Genesin CXCL., & Commentaria in Exodum, quibus eorum subjunctae sunt pleniores in Decalogum Praelectiones, ab Auctore recensitae & auctae. Cum Indicibus, Quaestionum variarum, SS. Scripturae locorum explicatorum, rerum & materialium necessariis. Rotterdam. 1651. [Whole in 3 vols. fol. Exodus covers pp. 713-1459 of Vol. I.]

CARTWRIGHT.—*Electa Thargumico-Rabbinica*; sive Annotationes in Exodum. Ex triplici Thargum, seu Chaldaica Paraphrasi, nempe Onkeli, Jonathanis, & Hierosolymitana; item ex Commentariis Rabbinorum, nempe Salomonis Jarchi, Aben Ezrae, & Abrabaneelis; nec non ex Libro Radicum, seu Lexico R. Davidis Kimchi, & ex aliorum vel Hebraeorum, vel Hebraizantium scriptis excerptae, una cum animadversionibus subinde interspersis. Graecorum porro Interpretum Versiones, & Vulgata Latina, passim expenduntur, earumque vel cum Hebraeo textu convenientia, vel ab eo discrepantia ostenditur. Authore *Christophoro Cartwrighto*, Eboracensis. Doctorum quorundam virorum de Rabbiniis eorumque scriptis Testimonia. London. 1653.

POOLE.—Synopsis Criticorum Aliorumque S. Scripturae Interpretum Voluminis Primi Pars Prior, Synopsis Criticorum Aliorumque S. Scripturae Interpretum Volumen I., completens Libros Omnes à Genesi ad Jobum, Divisum in duas Partes, Opera *Matthaei Poli* Londinensis. London, 1669. [Whole No. of pp., Vol. I., Part I. (Gen.—Ruth), 1247, of which pp. 315-510 on Exodus. Work complete in 5 vols. 1669. Best ed. by Leusden. Utrecht, 1684-96.]

CRITICI SACRI.—Annotata ad Pentateuchum, et Libros, qui sequuntur Historicos Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, I. et II. Samuelis. Sive Criticorum Sacrorum. Tomus I. [London, 1660.] Frankfurt am Main, 1695.—Annotatores ad Libros dictos hi sunt: Seb. Munsterus, Franciscus Vatablus, Seb. Castalis, Isidorus Clarius, Johannes Drusius, Hugo Grotius, Paulus Fagius in Pentateuchum. Idem in Paraphrasin Chaldaicam 4 priorum Capp. Geneseos. Masius in Josuam. Tractatus Inserti: Drusius de Mandragoris, pag. 286. Hugo Grotius in Decalogum, pag. 555. Jos. Scaliger de Decimis pag. 1322. Sixtinus Amama de Decimis pag. 1326. Ludovicus Capellus de Voto Jephthae p. 2046. [Vol. I. contains Gen.—II. Sam. Whole number of columns 2438, of which 431-710 are on Exodus. Work complete in 7 vols. 1695—.]

Also:

Criticorum Sacrorum, sive Lectissimarum in Sacro-Sancta Biblia Utriusque Foederis Annotationum atque Tractatum Theologico-Philologicorum Supplementum, Ubi non solum interspersa recentiori Belgarum Editioni additamenta continua serie fideliter ad unum exhibentur omnia, sed & complura alia, non minus Exquisita ac Maxime Huc Facientia, continne recensentur, eo quidem consilio ut & recenti nostrati & Londinensi veteri Autographo commode subnecti queant. Junctis sub eadem Indicibus ad universum opus locupletissimus. Tomus Primus. In quo quid praestitum & quatenus universi Operis hujus Oeconomia sequenti proxime pagina pluribus edocebit Praefatio. Frankfurt am Main, 1700. [Vol. I. Suppl. contains Gen.—Lev. Whole number of columns 2631, of which 821-1532 on Exodus. Vol. II. appeared 1701.]

CLERICUS (LECLERC).—Mosis Prophetæ Libri Quatuor; Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, et Deuteronomium, ex Translatione *Johannis Clerici*, cum ejusdem Paraphrasi Perpetua, Commentario

Philologico, Dissertationibus Criticis, et Tabulis Chronologicis ac Geographicis. Amsterdam. 1696. [Pp. 12, 568, of which pp. 1-180 on Exodus. First vol. on Pentateuch, containing Genesis, was published 1693.]

PATRICK.—A Commentary upon the Second Book of Moses, called Exodus. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Symon* [Patrick] Lord Bishop of Ely. [1696.] The second edition, corrected, London, 1704, pp. 724. [Latest ed. in Works, 9 vols., Oxford, 1859.]

J. H. MICHAELIS.—*ספר הקדש וארבע עשרים*: sive Biblia Hebraica, ex aliquot Manuscriptis et compluribus impressis Codicibus, item Masora tam edita, quam manuscripta, aliisque Hebraeorum criticis diligenter recensita. Praeter Nova Lemmata Textus S. in Pentateucho. accedunt Loca Scripturae Parallela, verba et realia, Brevesque Adnotationes, quibus nucleus Graecae LXX. Interpretum et Oo. Versionum exhibetur, difficiles in textu Dictiones et Phrases explicantur, ac dubia Res resolvuntur; ut succincti Commentarii vicem praestare possint. Singulis denique Columnis selectae variantes Lectones subiiciuntur Cura ac Studio *Jo. Heinr. Michaelis*, S. S. Theol. & Gr. ac Oo. Ling. in Acad. Frider. P. P. ord. et ex parte Opera Sociorum, ut pluribus in Praefatione dicitur. Halae Magdeburgicae. 1750.

HOUBIGANT.—Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Criticis et Versione Latina ad Notas Criticas facta. Accedunt Libri Graeci, qui Deutero-Canonici vocantur, in tres classes distributi. Autore *Carolo Francisco Houbigant*, Oratorii Jesu Sacerdote. Paris, 1753. Pentateuchus sive Libri Quinque Mosi. Tomus Primus. [Whole number of pages xcvi, 682, lv, of which pp. 171-317 on Exodus. Work complete in 4 vols. Reprint of Houbigant's Notes. 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main. 1777.]

SMITS.—Pentateuchus, seu Quinque Libri Moysis Vulgatae Editionis, Versione Belgica, Notis grammaticalibus, &c., elucidati.—*Liber Exodus Vulgatae editionis, Versione Belgica, Notis grammaticalibus, literalibus, criticis, &c., Prolegomeno, Dissertationibusque praemissis, immixtisque, elucidatus.* Autore *F. Wilhelmo Smits*, Ord. FF. Minorum Recollectorum, S. Theologiae Lectore bis jubilato, ac Provinciae Germaniae inferioris Patre perpetuo. Accedunt Animadversiones in Biblia Hebraica cum Notis criticis & Versione Latina ad Notas criticas facta. Authore *Carolo Francisco Houbigant*, Oratorii Jesu Sacerdoti. Vide Proleg. n. 24. 3 vols. Antwerp and Amsterdam. 1757-60. [Whole Pentat. in 12 vols., 1753-80. Vols. IX. sqq. edited after the death of Smits, by F. Petrus van Hove.]

J. D. MICHAELIS.—Deutsche Uebersetzungen des Alten Testaments mit Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte, von *Johann David Michaelis*. Göttingen and Gotha, 1769-83. [Whole in 13 Parts.]

DATHÉ.—Pentateuchus ex Recensione Textus Hebraei et Versionum Antiquarum Latine Versus Notisque Philologicis et Criticis Illustratus a *Joanne Augusto Dathio*, S. Theol. Doct. et Prof. Linguae Hebr. Ord. in Acad. Lipsiensi. Halae: 1781;—Editio Altera Emendatio, pp. xx 708, Halae: 1791. [Exodus fills pp. 227-364.]

GEDDES.—The Holy Bible, or the Books accounted sacred by Jews and Christians; otherwise called the Books of the Old and New Covenants; Faithfully translated from Corrected Texts of the Originals, with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes and Critical Remarks. By the Rev. Alexander Geddes, LL. D. Vol. I. London, 1792. [Vol. I. contains Genesis—Joshua, pp. 407, of which pp. 98-179 on Exodus. Whole in two vols. 1792-97.]

ROSENMUELLER.—*Ern. Frid. Car. Rosenmuelleri*, Theol. Doct. et Lingg. OO. in Acad. Lips. P. P. O. Scholia in Vetus Testamentum. Partis Primae, Genesim et Exodum Continentis, Volumen Secundum, [Exodum Continentis]. Cum Mappa Geographica. [Whole work, in XI Parts 23 (or 24) vols., 1788-1835.]

Editio Tertia, Sie ab Auctore Recognita, Emendata et Aucta, ut Novum Opus Videri Possit. Pp. 516. Lipsiae: 1822.

The following is an abridgment:

Ern. Frid. Car. Rosenmuelleri, Theol. Doct. et Litterr. OO. in Univ. Lips. P. P. O. Scholia in Vetus Testamentum in Compendium Redacta. Volumen Primum, Scholia in Pentateuchum Continentis. Pp. iv, 818. Lipsiae: 1828. [Abridgment not completed. Vols. I.-V. 1828-35. (Pent., Isa., Ps., Job, Ezek.) Exodus fills pp. 272-480 of vol. I.]

VATER.—Commentar über den Pentateuch von *Johann Severin Vater*, Prof. der Theologie u. der morgenländischen Sprachen. Mit Einleitungen zu den einzelnen Abschnitten der eingeschalteten Uebersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes's merkwürdigeren kritischen u. exegetischen Anmerkungen, u. eine Abhandlung über Moses u. die Verfasser des Pentateuchs. Zweiter Theil. Halle, 1802. [Pp. iv, 232, of which pp. 1-161 on Exodus.—Remainder gives Leviticus complete. Whole Pentateuch in 3 Parts. Halle, 1802-05.]

MAURER.—Commentarius Grammaticus Criticus in Vetus Testamentum in usum maxime Gymnasiorum et Academiarum adornatus. Scripsit *Franc. Jos. Valcut, Dominic. Maurer*, Phil. Doct. Soc. Historico-Theol. Lips. Sod. Ord. Volumen Primum. Pp. 703. Lipsiae, 1835. [Complete in 4 vols. (Vol. IV. scripsit, A. Heiligstedt.) Leipz. 1835-47. Exodus fills pp. 28-47 of vol. I., which contains (following the order also found in EV.) Gen.—Esther, Isa., Jer., Lam.]

BUSH.—Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Exodus; designed as a General Help to

Biblical Reading and Instruction. By *George Bush*, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit., N. Y. City University. In Two Volumes. [Pp. 300, 299.] Andover and New York, 1841.

BAUMGARTEN.—Theologische Commentar zum Pentateuch. Von *M. Baumgarten*, Philos. Dr., Theol. Lic., Privatdocenten zu Kiel. Erste Hälfte: Vom Anfang bis zum Gesetz. pp. c, 524. Kiel, 1843. Zweite Hälfte: Gesetzgebung, pp. xvi, 567. Kiel, 1844. [Exodus (cc. i-xix) fills pp. 389-524 in 1st Half, and (cc. xx-xl) pp. 1-124 in 2d Half.]

This Commentary, which covers the whole Pentateuch, was designed as part of a comprehensive work on the Old Testament. Another title is: Theologischer Commentar zum Alten Testament. Von *M. Baumgarten*, Philos. Dr., Theol. Lic., Privatdocenten zu Kiel. Erster Theil: Allgemeine Einleitung; Pentateuch. Erste Hälfte: Einleitung; Genesis; Exodus Cap. 1-19. Zweite Hälfte: Exodus Cap. 20-40; Leviticus; Numeri; Deuteronomium.—This plan has never been carried out.

KALISCH.—A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament. With a New Translation. By *M. Kalisch*, Phil. Doe., M. A. Exodus. London, 1855. [Pp. xxxii, 624. Heb. and Eng.—Genesis followed (1858) and Leviticus (2 Parts, 1867-72). Here the work stopped.]

BUNSEN.—Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. In drei Abtheilungen. Von *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen*. [Whole in 9 vols., 1858-70, with small extra vol. (1860) containing maps, etc.] Erster Band. Erste Abtheilung. Die Bibel. Uebersetzung und Erklärung. Erster Theil: Das Gesetz. Leipzig, 1858. [Pp. ccxc, 345, of which pp. 106-168 on Exodus (transl., with brief explanatory foot-notes).]

Also, *Id.*, Fünfter Band. Zweite Abtheilung. Bibelurkunden. Erster Theil. Das Gesetz und die Aelteren Propheten. Leipzig, 1860. [Pp. xxiv, 642, of which pp. 105-185, 232 seq., 262 seq., etc., on Exodus.]

KEIL.—Biblischer Commentar über d. Alte Testament. Herausgegeben von *Carl Friedr. Keil* u. *Franz Delitzsch*. Erster Theil: Die Bücher Mose's. Erster Band: Genesis u. Exodus. (Also under the title: Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Mose's von *Carl Friedrich Keil*, Dr. u. Prof. d. Theologie. Erster Band: Genesis u. Exodus.) Leipzig, 1861; 2d ed., 1866; 3d ed., 1878. [The whole in 15 vols. Pentateuch in 2 vols. Exodus fills pp. 318-378 (ed. 2) of vol. I.]

Eng. Trans.: Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. By *C. F. Keil*, D. D., and *F. Delitzsch*, D. D., Professor of Theology. Vol. I. The Pentateuch. Translated from the German by the Rev. James Martin, B. A., Nottingham. (Vol. II. *Id.*) Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1864. [Pentateuch in 3 vols. Vol. I. pp. 501, of which pp. 415-501 on Exodus, covering Exod. i. 1—xi. 10. Vol. II. pp. 486, of which 260 on Exodus (the remainder giving Leviticus entire).]

WORDSWORTH.—The Holy Bible, in the Authorized Version; with Notes and Introductions by *Chr. Wordsworth*, D. D., Bishop of Lincoln. Vol. I. The Five Books of Moses. [O. T. in 6 vols. London, 1864-72. New edition (unchanged), London, 1872-73. Exodus fills pp. 199-332 of vol. I., part I. Parts I. and II. are bound together and contain pp. xlviii, 332; viii, 288. The work is confined to the O. T., and is not to be confounded with the author's well-known Greek New Testament, with notes (4 vols., London, 1857).]

MURPHY.—A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus, with a New Translation. By *James G. Murphy*, D. D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. Edinburgh, 1866. American reprints, Andover, 1868; Boston, 1874 (Sunday School edition, with Introduction to Murphy's *Genesis*, by *Alvah Hovey*, D. D.); New York, 1881 (with preface by *John Hall*, D. D.).

JACOBUS.—Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Book of Exodus. From Egypt to Sinai [Chaps. I-XVIII]. By *Melancthon W. Jacobus*, Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. New York, 1874. Pp. 186.

LANGÉ.—Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk. Die Heilige Schrift Alten u. Neuen Testaments mit Rücksicht auf das theologisch-homiletische Bedürfniss des Pastoralantes in Verbindung mit namhaften evangelischen Theologen bearbeitet u. herausgegeben von *J. P. Lange*. Des Alten Testaments zweiter Theil: Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. (Also under the title: Die Bücher Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, oder die drei mittleren Bücher des Pentateuch als die Thorah Israels im engeren Sinne. Theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet von *J. P. Lange*, Consistorialrath, Dr. u. ordentl. Professor d. Theologie in Bonn.) Bielefeld u. Leipzig, 1874. [Whole in 20 parts. Part II. has pp. lvi, 387, of which 145 on Exodus.]

Eng. Trans.: A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with special reference to ministers and students. By *John Peter Lange*, D. D., Professor of Theology in University of Bonn, assisted by a number of eminent European Divines. Translated, enlarged and edited by *Philip Schaff*, D. D., Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theol. Seminary, New York; in connection with American and English scholars of various denominations. Vol. II. [of the Old Testament.] Exodus and Leviticus. (Also under the title: Exodus; or the Second Book of Moses. By *John Peter Lange*, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. Translated by *Charles M. Mead*, Ph. D., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.) New York, n. d. [1876].

[The whole in 24 vols., with the Apocrypha in supplementary vol. Vol. II. (of the O. T.) has pp. 50, 179, 206, of which 179 on Exodus. The volume contains also: Introduction to the Three Middle Books of the Pentateuch. By John Peter Lange, D. D., Professor of Theol. in the University of Bonn. Translated by Howard Osgood, D. D., Rochester, N. Y.]

"SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY."—The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. I. Part I. Genesis—Exodus. London and New York, 1874. [The whole in 10 vols. Vol. I. contains Pentateuch entire and has pp. xii, 928, of which pp. 237-442 on Exodus. The Introduction to Exodus is by Canon Cook; also the Commentary on chaps. i.-xix., and two essays (pp. 443-476) on Egypt and the Pentateuch. The Commentary on Exod. xx.-xl. is by Samuel Clark, M. A., Vicar of Bredwardine.]

REUSS.—La Bible. Traduction Nouvelle avec Introductions et Commentaires, par *Edouard Reuss*, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [O. T. in 7 parts; N. T. in 6 parts. 1874-79.] Ancien Testament. Troisième Partie. L'Histoire Sainte et La Loi (Pentateuque et Josué), II. Paris, 1879. [Vol. contains Exodus—Joshua; pp. 416, of which 106 on Exodus.]

DILLMANN.—Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Zwölfte Lieferung. Exodus u. Leviticus. Für die zweite Auflage, nach Dr. August Knobel, neu bearbeitet von Dr. August Dillmann, ord. Professor d. Theologie in Berlin. (So on original paper cover. Other titles are: Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Zwölfte Lieferung. Die Bücher Exodus u. Leviticus von Dr. August Dillmann. Zweite Auflage; also, Die Bücher Exodus u. Leviticus. Für die zweite Auflage nach Dr. August Knobel neu bearbeitet von Dr. August Dillmann, ord. Professor der Theologie in Berlin.) Leipzig, 1880. [Whole in 17 vols. Vol. XII. has pp. x, 639, of which 370 on Exodus. Leviticus complete in same vol.]

ELlicOTT'S OLD TESTAMENT COMMENTARY.—An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. By Various Writers. Edited by Charles John Ellicott, D. D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vol. I. London and New York, u. d. [Whole no. of pp., xxxiv, 576, of which pp. 185-338 on Exodus, by the Rev. George Rawlinson, M. A., Canon of Canterbury Cathedral and Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. The vol. contains also Genesis, by R. Payne Smith; Leviticus, by C. D. Ginsburg; and Numbers, by C. J. Elliott.]

PULPIT COMMENTARY.—The Pulpit Commentary, edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., Vicar and Rural Dean of St. Pancras, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; and by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell. With Introductions by the Rev. Canon F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Right Rev. H. Cotterill, D. D., F. R. S. E., Very Rev. Principal J. Tulloch, D. D., Rev. Canon G. Rawlinson, M. A., Rev. A. Plummer, M. A. [The vol. on Exodus under special title: as above, through "Exell," thence: Exodus. Exposition and Homiletics by Rev. George Rawlinson, M. A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Canterbury. Homilies by various authors. Rev. J. Orr, M. A., B. D., Rev. C. A. Goodhart, M. A., Rev. D. Young, B. A., Rev. J. Urquhart, Rev. H. T. Robjohns, B. A. London, 1882. [Pp. xi, 752, ix.]]

GINSBURG (in preparation).—The Cambridge Bible for Schools. General Editor, J. J. S. Perowne, D. D., Dean of Peterborough. Cambridge and London. The Book of Exodus, with Notes and Introduction, by the Rev. Christian D. Ginsburg, LL. D.

MACGREGOR (in preparation).—Hand-books for Bible Classes and Private Students. Edited by Rev. Marcus Dods, D. D., and Rev. Alexander Whyte, D. D. Edinburgh. The Book of Exodus. By James Macgregor, D. D., late of New College, Edinburgh.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

At Vanderbilt University, Nashville, the Old Testament chair is now occupied by Rev. W. W. Martin; the former occupant, Prof. T. J. Dodd, having resigned about one year ago. In the Nashotah Divinity School (Epis.) the Old Testament chair has been accepted by Rev. Joseph M. Clark, formerly of Syracuse, N. Y. In the Episcopal Divinity School of Cambridge, Mass., the work of teaching the Junior class in Hebrew and Old Testament history has been committed to Mr. M. Lindsay Kellum, who last spring received the degree of M. A. from Harvard.

The appointment of Prof. John P. Peters, Ph. D., to a professorship of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania is an important step forward in the line of Old Testament work. The duties of this chair will be performed by Prof. Peters in addition to his former work in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in West Philadelphia. Hebrew will be made an elective in the Senior year of the University; graduate Semitic courses will be offered, and lectures on Semitic literature and comparative philology will be delivered.

Men prepared to do Old Testament work do not have long to wait for an opportunity. Among the American students who this year took the degree of Doctor of philosophy at Leipzig, two, at least, have found positions waiting them. Dr. Ira M. Price is filling the position of Instructor in Hebrew and the cognate languages in the Baptist Union Theological Seminary at Morgan Park; and Dr. J. A. Craig occupies a similar position in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O. From these men, with the training which they have received, much will be expected.

The establishment of a Department of Oriental Languages in the University of Toronto, with a *Pass* and an *Honor* Course is deserving of special notice. In the latter course, besides lectures on Semitic literature and history, a full and thorough course is laid out in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic and Assyrian. Dr. McCurdy, under whose direction the department has been organized, is well known as an accomplished Oriental scholar, having for some years served as a professor at Princeton. The development of this new department will be watched with interest.

In the September *Expositor*, under the heading "Recent Assyrian and Egyptian Research," there is published a criticism of Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch's *Assyrische Lesestücke*. The critic, by his *personal* attack upon Delitzsch, has done himself and the journal little credit. One would suppose that the day had come when, at least among English and American critics, vituperation might well be dispensed with. However vulnerable Prof. Delitzsch's work may be, he has done so much for the cause of Assyriology that such a criticism as the one referred to is entirely out of place. Nor is it probable that, when the facts are sifted, so many slips will be found to have been made.

Very few works, if any, in the Old Testament department that have appeared within the past ten years, have attracted the attention which has been accorded to the new edition of Ezekiel, by Dr. Carl Cornill, of Marburg, a review of which appeared in the July number of *Hebraica*. It is recognized as a masterly specimen of textual criticism, and has brought the author into deserved prominence. At the recent fifth centennial of Heidelberg he was one of the few to receive the degree of Doctor of Theology—a rare honor, considering the occasion and the fact that Dr. Cornill is only thirty-two years of age. The Prussian cultus ministerium has transferred him to fill the Old Testament chair at the large University at Königsberg, as Professor Ordinarius. He had been Extraordinarius, or associate-professor, only a few months.

The word "Hebrew" has quite generally been derived from the stem 'abhar, "pass over," the reference being to the fact that Abram, the forefather of the Hebrews, came from beyond the Euphrates, from Mesopotamia. Of late a new view has found some friends, notably among the more advanced critics. It is thought by many that not the Euphrates, but the Jordan, is the river here to be presupposed. The new interpretation is closely connected with the idea of the early Israelitish history maintained by this school. They claim that the Israel of history is simply a union of desert tribes who gradually formed themselves into a nation on the east bank of the Jordan, and with whom, possibly, a few stray Hebrews from Egypt connected themselves, and that the tribes thus united crossed the Jordan and gradually took possession of western Palestine. *Ibhrim* (i. e., Hebrews) are, accordingly, those who crossed the river Jordan. A defense of this interpretation will be found in Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.

The Christian-Jewish movement in Southern Russia has attracted considerable attention in the columns of the religious press. Its peculiarity consists in this, that it appears to be the first general movement among any section of the Jews toward Christianity that was the result not of outward influences, but of inner growth and thought. The leader, Joseph Rabinowitz, is a lawyer, and not a Christian convert. His independent study of the New Testament brought him to believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the fulfillment of the law and the prophets; and the watchword of the movement is "Jesus, our Brother." Although they still seem in some things to see darkly as through a glass, yet the progress of the movement within the past three years indicates a healthy growth in the knowledge and faith of Christianity, and promises well for the future. They have published a number of "Documents," consisting of confessions of faith, etc., and their leaders have published several sermons in Hebrew, some of which have also been translated into German. The leading "Documents" of these people have been translated and published by one of our contributors, Professor George H. Schodde, and published in the *Lutheran Quarterly*, of Gettysburg, Pa., July, 1886.

By the historico-critical method of biblical research, now accepted as the correct manner of studying the word of truth, nothing is meant but the drawing out of the exact sense which the author purposed to put into a passage at the time when he penned it. The method is a revolt against the old allegorical method; which has been more or less in vogue from pre-Christian times among the Jews in Alexandria, down to our own day. This method failed to recognize the fact that revelation is a development and an unfolding of God's truth in history and in time. For the old method the Bible was simply a collection of proof-passages for this or that doctrine of the Church, and it recognized no historical inconsistency in making the faith of Abraham fully the equal of that of the Apostle Paul. The new method recognizes the growth in revealed truth, both in its revelation and in the exhibition of the truths of this revelation in the lives and convictions of God's people at various stages in the Old Testament and New Testament developments. In other words, it is historical; and in order to be this, it must be critical in the true sense of the word. The new method is gaining ground rapidly; the old, however, is still to be found. One will notice its employment by many ministers. That thing for which true Bible students should work most zealously is the entire abolition of this baneful relic of antiquity.

Most people suppose that the venerable Professor Franz Delitzsch is only a learned lecturer and commentator, taking no interest in the weal and woe of the church and in the great problems of the day. But this is far from being true. He is wide awake to these interests, and does much in favor of an intelligent and conservative solution of these problems. He is especially prominent as the leading advocate of Jewish missions. He has been trying for many years to arouse the German church to her duty in regard to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. He, in conjunction with a society for Jewish missions, has published a quarterly, entitled "*Satt auf Hoffnung*" (seed on hope), devoted to this difficult work of Jewish missions. He has published in the interests of the work his masterly Hebrew translation of the New Testament, the result of decades of patient work, of which more than 40,000 copies have been scattered among the Jewish population of Eastern Europe, bringing many to a recognition of Christ as the fulfillment of the Old Testament promises concerning a Redeemer. He has revived the old *Instituta Judaica* in the evangelical faculties of nine German and a number of Scandinavian universities. These societies are devoting time and work to the study of post-biblical Hebrew literature and to Jewish mission-work. Although more than three score and ten, Prof. Delitzsch is yet one of the noblest of God's workmen in the church militant.

Larger works, consisting entirely or in great part of Hebrew print, were first published by a Jewish family, living in Soncini, hence often called the Soncinians, and thence they transplanted the art of Hebrew printing to several Italian cities, chiefly Venice, whence it was further transplanted by Jewish printers to Turkey. The only and oldest Hebrew publications issued in Turkey appeared in Constantinople. The oldest Hebrew publication in Italy was a Ritual of Moses of Conzy, which appeared in Venice in 1450, only ten years after the invention of the art of printing. An edition of Kimchi's grammar was issued as early as 1461. Soon Christians began to compete with the Jews in publishing Hebrew works. Daniel Bomberg, originally from Antwerp, studied the Hebrew, and at a great expense started a printing establishment for the purpose of issuing Hebrew works. In 1511 he published a complete Hebrew Bible. In France only few Hebrew books were published; but in 1508 a Hebrew grammar by Tissard made its appearance. In Spain and Portugal, in 1492, the commentary of David Kimchi on "the former prophets," i. e., Samuel, etc., and in 1497 his commentary on Isaiah and Jeremiah were published. In Austria, the first Hebrew publications made their appearance in Prague. The first Hebrew type used in Germany was employed in a work published in 1475 by Peter Niger, and entitled "*Contra perfidos Judaeos de conditionibus veri Messiae*." In the seventeenth century Heddernheim and Dyhernfurt were the centres of the Hebrew publishing interests in Germany. In this department Holland surpassed Germany; many Hebrew works appeared, especially in Amsterdam, which city soon controlled the book-trade in this line. Competitors to Amsterdam arose afterwards in Germany and elsewhere, and forced down the prices of Hebrew books. Many old rabbinical books were published, and Christian scholars did more in that department than they do now.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Outlines of Jewish History.* By M. Friedlander. London: Longmans. 12mo.....3s. 6d.
Philological Studies. Part. I. Mechanism of Language. By James Stevens. Turin. 8vo, pp. iv, 135.....M.3.50
The Book; or, When, and by Whom, the Bible was written. By Rev. S. Leroy Blake. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc. Pp. 283..\$1.50

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, hrsgb. v. Lic. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill. (S. R. Driver) in *Contemporary Review*, Oct., '86.
Biblical Essays, or Exegetical Studies. By Dr. C. H. H. Wright, ib.
The Religion of Israel. By Ed. Köuig, ib.
The Book of Zechariah. 6. The Shepherd of Israel. By Marcus Dods in *Expositor*, Oct., '86.
The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald. By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, ib.
The Revised Version of the Old Testament. The Book of Job. By Prof. A. B. Davidson, ib.
The Revision of Genesis. By Prof. Chas. R. Brown in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., '86.
Ancient Book-making. By Prof. H. P. Smith, ib.
Outcomes of the Bible not found in the Bible. By I. E. Dwinell, ib.
Jeremiah, the Prophet of Personal Godliness; a Study in Hebrew Religion. By Arch. Duff, LL.D., ib.
The Book of Jubilees. By Prof. George H. Schodde, ib.
The Sanction of the Decalogue. By Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., ib.
Tombs near the Damascus Gate. By Selah Merrill in *Independent*, Oct. 7, '86.
The English Bible in the Theological Seminaries. By Prof. T. Harwood Pattison, D. D., ib., Sept. 30, '86.
The Moabite Stone, ib.
The History of India as told by its own Historians,—Gujarat. By the late Sir Edward Clive Bagley. (A. N. Wollaston) in *Academy*, Sept. 11, '86.
Qohélet und die nach-aristotelische Philosophie. Von August Palm. (Thomas Tyler) ib.
Egypt and Syria: their Physical Features in relation to Bible History. By Sir J. W. Dawson. (Amelia B. Edwards) ib.
Laconerie, Babylonia and China, ib., Aug. 7, '86.
The Book of Genesis. A Translation from the Hebrew in which the constituent elements are separated; to which is added an attempted restoration of the original documents used by the latest Reviser. By Francois Lenormant. Translated from the French with an Introduction and Notes by the author of "Mankind, their Origin and Destiny." London: Longmans. *Saturday Review*, Oct. 2, '86.
Recent Egyptian Research. Ib., Aug. 7, 14, '86.
The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure. An Examination of Recent Theories. By Prof. E. C. Bissell, in *Dublin Review*, July, '86.
A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ. By Emil Schürer. (Heman Lincoln) in *Bapt. Quarterly Review*, Oct., '86.
The Six Days of the Creation, the Fall and the Deluge. By J. B. Reimensnyder, in *Reformed Quarterly Review*, Oct., '86.
Pictures of Jerusalem, the Holy City. By S. J. M. Eaton, D. D., in *Presbyterian Banner*, Oct. 13, '86.
The Patriarchal Times. XI. The Pilgrimage of Abraham. By Rev. Thos. Whitelaw, in *Monthly Interpreter*, Oct., '86.
Buddhism in its Relation to Brahmanism. By Monier Williams, in *J. R. A. S.*, April, '86.
Coins of the Jews, International Numismata Orientalia. By Madden, in *Athenaeum*, Aug. 14, '86.
The Salt Mountains of Palestine. By Selah Merrill, in *Scientific American*, Sept. 25, '86.
The first Indications of Gnosticism in Asia Minor. By Prof. Godet, in *Expositor*, Sept., '86.
Biblical Topography. VIII. Further Egyptian Sites—Memphis, Thebes, Migdol, Syrene. By Rev. Canon G. Rawlinson, in *Monthly Interpreter*, Oct., '86.
The Song of Solomon. By Prof. R. A. Redford, ib.
The Week of Seven Days. By the Bishop of Carlisle in *Contemporary Review*, Oct., '86.
Buddha as a Moralist. By Clundra Bose in *Caleutta Review*, July, '86.
Traditions of the Tower of Babel. By H. A. Guerber in *Observer*, Sept. 30, '86.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

DECEMBER, 1886.

NO. 4.

IF the question of the study of a given subject is made to turn on the importance of that subject, or on the number and magnitude of the difficulties which the study of that subject presents, or on the constantly increasing delight with which its study is attended, or on the fact that this subject, of all subjects, stands in need of honest, scientific investigation, or on the valuable practical results which will follow its investigation,—if we decide to take up or lay down the study of a given subject on these grounds, surely no biblical student, who has for a moment considered the claims put forth by the subject of *prophecy*, should hesitate to enter upon a close and exhaustive study of that topic.

BUT is it important? Is it not rather a subject which belongs to the past, one which is without relation, out of relation indeed, to the real issues of the day? Is it not a subject for “specialists” or “cranks” to consider? Is not time spent upon it practically thrown away? These questions receive an affirmative answer, if not in theory, at least in practice, from the great mass of intelligent students. The *unimportance* of this department of study is quite generally conceded. They who concede it would seem to have overlooked the part played by Hebrew prophets in the advancement of the kingdom of God upon earth; the direct personal influence which the lives and words of these men have exerted upon nations and individuals of every age; the large proportion of Holy Writ which is either prophecy, or prophecy fulfilled; the absolute necessity of a knowledge of the laws and principles of prophecy for a correct understanding not only of the prophetic writings, but of any portion of the Bible; the fact “that no part of Scripture sheds such direct light on experience, none so follows the soul through all the windings of a God-forgetting, worldly, embittered, repentant, God-seeking life, none so meets and

appeals to the soul in every emergency, and has the right word to say to every variety of feeling." If the study of the Bible is important, then the study of its greatest mystery, prophecy, is important; and in so far as one neglects it, he narrows and perverts his conception of God, man and redemption.

THE difficulties which meet one in the study of prophecy are, it must be confessed, great; and to this fact may well be attributed the prevailing tendency to slight it. Prophecy is, for the most part, poetry; for the majority of men, poetry is distasteful. It is frequently a poetry characterized by obscurity, "full of rapid transitions, obscure allusions, highly imaginative representations;" to the majority of men that which requires close study is burdensome. We have only fragments, so to speak, of the original discourses or writings. We are occidental; the prophets were oriental. Historical data, needed for the understanding of many portions, are lacking. Of the prophets themselves our knowledge is scanty and unsatisfactory. Prophecy, like miracles, is a divine mystery, and was not intended to be fully understood. These, with other difficulties, constantly present themselves. But these difficulties are those which meet the student of any portion of Holy Scripture. And besides, they are difficulties which, in great measure, the student may overcome. The "obscure style" of the prophets, so frequently referred to, is a style which has characterized the greatest literary efforts of all ages. What a translation presents, in obscure form, is often entirely clear in the original. With a proper arrangement of the prophetic writings, with a proper method of study, with a proper idea of what prophecy is, and of what the prophets were, a large amount of what seems to be unintelligible will become clear. Difficulties will doubtless remain; but what man expects to possess himself of all wisdom? The very existence of difficulties should prove an additional incentive to the study. With nothing to overcome, study would be a farce, and life a burden.

WE cannot conceive a more interesting, or even fascinating, topic for study, than this same subject of *prophecy*. It has been urged against its study that they who take it up are carried away with it, and become, too frequently, fanatics. However this may be, it is true that once in possession of the leading facts of prophecy, and once imbued with the spirit of prophetic study, the student will find no other to surpass it, in the measure of satisfaction which it brings, or in the intense interest which it begets. And why should it be otherwise? Is any theme more instructive, more attractive than

that of human redemption? What were the prophets but religious teachers? What is prophecy but "religious instruction"? What is Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament but "the New Testament in the Old—the ever living and developing idea which inspired the faith, hope, love of the Old Testament saints, and gave their elementary redemption its sole efficacy and grace"?* To overcome the difficulties of prophetic study, as has been stated, it is necessary to have a proper method of study, and a proper idea of what prophecy is. The possession of these is also necessary, and, it may perhaps be said, *all* that is necessary to make the study one of peculiar interest, and of special delight. Did a man ever really *study* prophecy and find it uninteresting?

MOST of all, however, we must emphasize the fact that the subject of prophecy stands, to-day, in need of honest and scientific investigation; and that it is a duty resting upon Christian students to take up this investigation. Words too strong can scarcely be found to describe the methods of procedure employed by those who, at present, constitute a vast majority of the body of the students of prophecy. Prophecy and prediction, ideas entirely distinct, are confused. All prophecy is made predictive. What is not even prophecy, not to speak of prediction, is treated as such. Literalism is made supreme, and in its service, no inconsistencies of logic, no violation of grammatical rules, no disregard of historical data are deemed too flagrant, if, forsooth, numbers can be figured out satisfactorily. The great mistake,—and the magnitude of it will never be appreciated till the end has come,—is the failure to separate the substance of prophecy from its form. In other words, the method is superficial, unscientific. It works only on the surface, and is compelled to twist these surface-facts into consistency with each other. It deals only with the husks, never finding the kernel. It fails to discover the great principles lying underneath, and to employ them. The method has come down from the past century, but flourishes now even more vigorously than ever before. "The efforts to show the literal fulfillment of the predictions of Daniel, in the history of Israel from the exile to the advent, in its dreadful inconsistencies of interpretation have so disgraced the science of biblical interpretation, that it is a marvel that the book has survived such cruel manipulation. . . . Predictive prophecy has been made a burden to apologetics by the abuse that has been made of it by self-constituted defenders of the faith and presumptuous champions of orthodoxy.

* Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*. p. 63.

It is necessary that evangelical critics should rescue predictive prophecy from the hands of those who have made such sad mistakes."

These words of Professor Briggs are too true. The time has come when rational and logical methods in the interpretation of prophecy should be employed. Let our critical and scientific students take up the work.

THE question of practical results, of the practical use to be made of the results of prophetic study, presents itself. This differs from the question of importance; for we may often concede to be important, what does not have, at least directly, a practical issue. Putting aside minor points, which might well deserve a presentation, we may reduce the whole question to one of fact. Is it of practical importance to know the *truth*? If, as we confidently believe, the prevailing method is a false one, will not this error work bad results? If, as we are equally confident, there is a correct method, will not a familiarity with it, a knowledge of it, an employment of it, bring practical advantage? If the adoption of one or the other of two methods affects the meaning of three-fourths of the Sacred Scriptures, is it not a practical question as to which shall be employed? It is this very necessity of choice which leads so many to throw aside entirely the whole subject. But in view of what has been said, the honest, conscientious student cannot well afford to do this. The Word of God has been committed to our keeping, not to be laid upon the shelf, but to be studied. Surely, the Author of the Word must himself have made a serious mistake, if he has filled it with so large an amount of useless rubbish, material for which so many of us find no practical use. It is possible, on the other hand, that it may be *we* who, in failing to find, or perhaps even to search for, a practical use for this large portion of Sacred Writ, have made, or are making, the mistake.

THE LITERARY PROBLEM OF GEN. I.—III.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,

Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

The question of the right of a literary analysis of the Pentateuch lies at the basis of all the Old Testament discussions of the last century. The key-note of these discussions was struck by the Roman Catholic physician in France, Astruc, when, in 1753, he published his *Memoires*, in which he defended the position that Moses, in writing the Book of Genesis, had drawn chiefly from two sources,—one with the name Elohim, the other with the name Jehovah for God,—and, to a limited extent, had used ten other documents. This idea met, at first, with more opposition than favor. But when later introduced into German critical circles, chiefly through the advocacy, though in modified form, of the influential Eichhorn, it readily and speedily secured the adherence of nearly every Old Testament specialist. And to-day a doubt as to the fact of an analysis is rarely expressed by a German scholar. That the Pentateuch is a literary composition drawn from various sources, and that the stratifications in its structure are readily discernible to the critical eye, is, among Germans, almost an axiom; it is certainly a fixed tradition of critical investigation. The question is no longer whether these books can be analyzed, but *how* this is to be done. It is significant that, in Wellhausen's elaborate analysis of the Hexateuch, he does not, with a single sentence, defend the right of this process, but proceeds immediately to dissect the various chapters. Undoubtedly much of the fruitlessness of the Pentateuchal controversy, of late, has been owing to the fact that this state of affairs is but imperfectly understood and appreciated by those who would defend the old traditional views. In the American phase of the controversy especially, little attention has been paid to this side of the question. As matters actually stand, the discussion between the conservative and the more liberal scholars starts from different premises; the latter arguing from the stand-point of the analysis as a "sure" result of modern investigation; the former treating the matter, often ignorantly and superficially, as something of little moment and of less foundation. Now, as a matter of fact, we do not have that critical process as an historical background which Germany has; and if the results of this process are to be refuted, it will be necessary to examine the sources whence they are drawn. In other words, the composite character and the literary analysis, especially of the Pentateuch, must receive the attention which its fundamental position among Old Testament problems deserves. What we propose is to submit, for information and study, a concise statement of the controversy so far as it relates to Gen. I.—III. This is done, not in order to discuss the pros and cons of the question, but rather to show *what* these are, and thus to aid the student in settling the matter for himself.

The thesis of the analyst is briefly this: These chapters did not originally belong to one and the same literary work, but were drawn from two different sources by the writer and editor of the Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch. The portion drawn from the first source is chap. I. 1—II. 4a; that drawn from the second is II. 4b to the end of III. and further. The arguments adduced for this claim are not always the same by all writers, but the leading propositions are these:

The use made of the names for God shows the composite character of these chapters. It will be noticed that up to chap. 11. 4a only the name Elohim is employed for this purpose, while after that, with one exception, only the double name *Jehovah Elohim* is found. There can be no doubt as to the facts in the case; the only question is as to the meaning of these facts. The analyst claims that these facts indicate that one of the literary sources employed the name *Elohim* exclusively for God; it is, therefore, generally called the *Elohistic* document; the other work used exclusively the word *Jehovah* (or *Yahweh*) for this purpose, and is accordingly called the *Yahvistic* document, the name *Elohim* in Gen. 11. 4 seq. being added later by the editor or redactor of the whole work. This conclusion is drawn, however, not only from these chapters, but from the whole Book of Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus. It will be seen, by an examination of these portions, that often whole chapters use exclusively the name *Jehovah*, and others exclusively the name *Elohim* for the divinity. This is done by the latter document down to Exod. vi., where verse 2 seq. are interpreted to mean that according to the Elohistic writer, of whose document this chapter forms a part, the name of *Jehovah* had not been revealed to the fathers, but that God had been known to them only by the name *El Shaddai*, which is accepted as the equivalent of *Elohim*. This word the Elohistic writer from these premises uses for God down to Exod. vi., but after that he uses *Jehovah* and *Elohim* promiscuously. The Yahvistic writer is represented as not having acted from this historical standpoint, and has been guilty of the anachronism of using "*Jehovah*" also in the days preceding the exodus.

This certainly remarkable use of the names of God down to the sixth chapter of Exodus is accompanied by other facts that are used to prove that the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections should be separated. It is noticed that each of these sections shows certain peculiarities of style and diction not found in the other. In regard to Gen. i.-iii. alone, Dillmann, in his edition of Knobel's Commentary, draws attention to the following: The Yahvistic writer, i. e., the author of chap. 11. 4b seq., uses the verb "to make" or "to form," while the Elohist uses "to create;" the animals are called "beasts of the field," and not "beasts of the earth;" he speaks of "the shrub of the field" and not "the herb of the field." Certain expressions* peculiar to Gen. 11. and 111. are never found, or only rarely, in the sections where *Elohim* is used.

This argument is rounded by the claim that the various Elohistic and Yahvistic sections differ in their manner of representing and describing events. In regard to the chapters before us, Dillmann says that over against the simple manner of chap. i., in which the leading facts are emphasized, chap. 11. 4b seqq. shows a decided preference for the description of side-issues and cause and effect, as also for picture sceneries, for views growing out of a closer reflection and more thoughtful study. The manner of speaking of God is more familiar than that of the Elohist, e. g., God *forms* the animals and man; he *breathes* into his nostrils the breath of life; he *plants* the garden of Eden; he takes a rib out of Adam and *makes* it into a woman, and *closes* the opening; he *brings* the animals to man; he *walks* in the cool of the evening; he speaks as though *jealous* of man. Out of these facts and facts of a like nature found in connection with sections employing the word *Elohim* for God, the critics have drawn what they regard as a correct descrip-

* These are הפעם, בעבור, לבלתי, מה זאת, עצבון, לקול, שמעי, etc.

tion of the character of the Elohist and Yahvistic writings. It must be clearly understood that the full force of this argument can not be seen from Gen. I.—III. alone, but an examination must be made of the greater portion of the Pentateuch in order to test the justice or injustice, the weakness or the strength, of this claim.

The conservative scholars, while of course not denying the facts in the case, furnish an entirely different explanation of them. The position is taken that these names have different meanings and that their use is regulated by the sense and the connection; that Elohim is the general term for God and is employed when reference is made chiefly to his omnipotence, and that Jehovah is the name of God when considered as the one who revealed himself to Israel as the gracious God of promise and of the covenant grace. Keil, in his "Introduction" to the Old Testament, § 25, starting from this view, states that Exod. vi. 2, forming an epoch in the history of the relations between Jehovah and Israel, also causes a change in the more or less frequent use of the names for God. Before this epoch God had revealed himself as Jehovah only in promises, and as El Shaddai possessing the power to fulfill his promises. For this reason the name Jehovah is found in the first half of Genesis only where there is reference to the revelation of deliverance commenced actually with the call to Abraham, while Elohim remains the general name for God in relation to the world and the creatures; whereas in the other half of Genesis the same facts continue, but that after God has concluded the covenant and made promises to him as El Shaddai, the latter name is also used as a name for the God of the covenant by the side of Jehovah; and as El Shaddai is then used rather more for poetic diction, the name Elohim is used in its room even to express the special covenant relation; and so in the latter portion of Genesis the name Jehovah occurs but seldom. This difference in the ideas of Jehovah and Elohim holds good throughout the Pentateuch, and the words are never used promiscuously, and a correct interpretation of Exod. vi. 2 seq. will confirm this.* The other matters mentioned in corroboration of this principal argument, the difference in style and manner of presentation, are regarded as being the natural results of the difference in the subject-matter treated, in so far as they are regarded as true conclusions from the text of the book.

The second argument has more exclusive reference to the chapters before us, and consists in the claim that the two writings do not harmonize in their description of the same event, and in reality give different and contradictory accounts of creation. The cautious Bleek, in his *Einleitung*, § 37, voices this view in these words:

"According to chap. I., the creation of the animals takes place before the creation of the human race, both male and female; according to chap. II., this takes place between the creation of the man and the woman. Then in chap. I., the creation of the herbs of the earth is the immediate result of God's creative word, while in chap. II. this is represented as dependent upon rain and the work of man. Further, a certain difference between the statements in regard to the original relation existing between God and man cannot be denied, namely, that according to chap. I. man was from the beginning created in the image of God, while in chaps. II. and III. it seems that man only gradually had reached this stage through his distinguishing between right and wrong."

While the later writers in the ranks of the analysts have given up the standpoint that we have two rival accounts of creation in these chapters, and teach also

* Cf. Keil, Commentary on the Pentateuch, *in loco*.

that the statements in the opening verses of chap. II. 4b seq. are but introductory, to the end of chap. II. and of chap. III., and that the object of the whole section is to narrate the fall of man; yet the position is adhered to, that between the statements of the two chapters in reference to the creation of man and of the animals and plants there is a marked difference; and this seems to be not without a foundation in fact, as a careful perusal of these verses will show.

The argument is met by the conservative side with an exegesis of these verses that excludes the possibility of contradictory accounts. The position is taken that these verses are a direct continuation of the previous sections and do not purpose to give a second account of the act of creation at all, but only of the planting and preparation of Eden as the place in which the first stages in the development of man shall take place. The security or insecurity of this position rests to a great extent upon the meaning assigned to a number of leading words in these verses, notably to "the earth" in verse 4 and "was" in verse 5, the former of which is restricted to the garden of Eden and the latter, as a parallel to "sprung up" in the same verse receives the meaning of "growing" or "becoming." Very properly objection is also raised to the translation proposed of II. 4b-7, which makes verses 5 and 6 parenthetical expressions, and verse 7 the continuation of verse 4b. The full facts in the case and the bearings on this question can best be learned by a comparison of the exegesis offered by the representatives of the two schools. Keil is probably the best for the conservative side, and Dillmann as good as any for the side of the analysts. The former is accessible in English, but not the latter.

In this connection we add a few remarks:

1) The problem as such is merely a literary and critical one, and not dogmatical. Only the facts in the case and not any theory concerning the origin and character of the books of the Bible can settle this question. It refers solely to the human side of the origin of the Bible, to the question whether in composing Gen. I.-III. the writer made use of two literary documents and united them in his account, or did not. The great question is, What are the exact facts and what do they imply? The fact that analysts have abused this problem for destructive purposes should not close our eyes to the real character of the question.

2) In itself there can be no objection to a documentary theory. Writing existed at a very early stage, and the facts of revelation were early known at least to some of mankind. Already in Seth's day (Gen. IV. 26) people began to call upon the name of the Lord, and Adam's acts and words in Gen. III. 9 seq. show that he had been made acquainted with God as the creator and the just judge. Nothing is more natural than that these truths revealed so early to mankind should have been put down in a written form by either inspired or uninspired pens, and that the writer of Genesis, in compiling his account of the creation and the fall of man, should have made use of one or more of these records for his purpose. We know from the direct statements of Old Testament history that the inspired writers made it a rule to consult the official records, and we know also that the Pentateuch itself elsewhere quotes from other books. And so considered in itself, the acceptance of a literary analysis of these chapters, or of the whole Book of Genesis, or of the whole Pentateuch, or of any other book, does not conflict with any correct view of the origin of the divine books.

3) Nor does such an acceptance of an analysis, at least of these chapters, in itself involve the rejection of the Mosaic authorship. It must be said, however,

that nearly all of those who accept such an analysis reject the old view that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, and understand that he wrote a greater or smaller portion of it. Originally such was not the case, and nothing was further from Astruc's mind than the denial of the Mosaic authorship. The very title of his work reads, "Memoirs which Moses seems to have employed in the composition of Genesis." Of course, the acceptance of the theory in other books than Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus, cannot but involve this denial to a greater or less extent.

4) The leading arguments pro and con are directly connected with the use of the names Jehovah and Elohim, and both methods of explaining the most remarkable use of these words down to Exod. vi., meet with serious difficulties. The acceptance of a difference in the meaning of these terms is justified by facts, but while the application of this view to the earlier chapters of Genesis is quite successful, it is very strained in the last ten or twelve chapters. On the other hand, the analysts have been compelled to accept two documents using the term Elohim, one of which had already been incorporated into the Yahvistic document before this was united with the other Elohist to form our Genesis. We doubt whether an explanation of this phenomenon fully satisfactory and one that can cover all the actual cases, has yet been furnished. The names used for God in Genesis are still the riddle of the Pentateuchal sphinx.

5) The willingness on the part of many analysts to accept "contradictions" in the records of Genesis and elsewhere, strikes us as a violation of the premises from which they proceed. They all accept a redactor who united the alleged documents into one book; yet he seems to have permitted so many opposing statements to remain, that some of the chapters seem little less than a bundle of contradictions. The effort, manifestly, often is not to see if two accounts can be made to harmonize, but whether they can be compelled to militate against each other. Even if we should accept the composite character of the Book of Genesis, the natural supposition is that, as the editor or writer understood these accounts, they were not contradictory. It is absurd to believe that, in a carefully edited book like our Pentateuch, even aside from all divine influence or inspiration, there should have been left hundreds of errors and contradictions. Manifestly the purpose should be to attempt not to make two verses or chapters disagree, but to make them agree, as they evidently were understood to do by their author or editor. Approaching the literary problem of Gen. i.—iii. in this spirit, there seems no valid reason for seeing any contradictory statements in them. It is possible, without any violation of the laws of language or of thought, to see in these chapters a harmonious account of the creation and fall of man. It is, of course, also possible to understand these chapters as giving different accounts of the same thing; but the question remains, Which of these two possibilities is the one to accept? All other things being equal, the former is the more natural and rational, and fair literary criticism, here as elsewhere, will accept this stand-point. Of course, if the chapters do harmonize, this in itself does not decide the question of composite character. The latter is still a possibility; but if such contradictions existed, the analysis would almost be a necessity.

6) We repeat that the object of this article has been merely to state candidly, calmly and fairly, the question in regard to the literary problem of Gen. i.—iii., and not to advocate either side. Which is right? This every conscientious student of God's Word must decide for himself.

RELIGION AS AN ELEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

There were in ancient times two small countries which, simply as such, have had more to do in originating the influences that have been most conspicuous in the history of civilization than perhaps any of the great empires of either ancient or modern times. Of one of these Dr. Edersheim has said that "it is impossible to think of it without a wonder and admiration which are only deepened the more we endeavor to trace in every direction the obligations under which we lie to it. The land was small, only covering—apart from its colonies—an area equal to one-third of that of England and Wales. Its population was insignificant in point of numbers, the free citizens of its several states not amounting to the population of Scotland at the present day; while Athens,"—for of course this little country is ancient Greece—"while Athens, the centre of its most powerful and lasting influence, possessed, with the exception of its slaves, not more than 21,000 citizens above the age of twenty. What a land, and what a city, to have effected what they have done."

Of the other country alluded to above, one of our authorities speaks thus: "The Holy Land is not in size, or physical characteristics proportioned to its moral and historical position, as the theatre of the most momentous events in the world's history. It is but a strip of country about the size of Wales, less than one hundred and forty miles in length, and barely forty miles in average breadth, on the very frontier of the East, hemmed in between the Mediterranean Sea on the one hand, and the enormous trench of the Jordan Valley on the other, by which it is cut off from the main land of Asia behind it." Neither in commerce, in war, in the arts, in schools of philosophy, in politics, does this small country compare in history with the countries adjoining on the south, the north, or the east; yet who will say that in point of positive and decisive influence upon the course and growth of the world's civilization, all of these combined can contest the palm with this narrow spot of ground alone?

Doubtless, in the history of human civilization there are other great names besides these: Egypt, Assyria, Italy, Northern Africa at the time when Carthage was in its glory, and those modern nations in which has appeared what Mommsen calls "a new cycle of culture, connected in several stages of its development with the perishing or perished civilization of the Mediterranean states, as this was connected with the primitive civilization of the Indo-Germanic stock, but destined, like the earlier cycle, to traverse an orbit of its own." Yet the question here is not as to the great part any empire or city may have played upon the historical stage, nor as to its achievements "in arts and arms." Human civilization, properly seen, is not sporadic and occasional, nor is it to be estimated by what any one nation, or group of nations, may have attained to, or the splendor of that height of glory and power from which, one after the other, they have fallen. It is rather that result of human improvement upon the whole which is found at the

end of centuries and cycles of centuries, and in which all the good of the past is found treasured in the institutions, the resources, the moral and intellectual condition, and the general well-being of the present. It may be seen beforehand to be possible that those influences and causes which have been most powerful in producing this result, may have existed independently of extent of territory, of military supremacy, and even of that "wealth of nations" which after all is "wealth" only in a very narrow and inadequate sense. The "poor wise man" who "by his wisdom delivered the city," yet whom "no man remembered," may stand for us as the type of that which has been the real and permanent element of beneficent growth, in that developing civilization whose progress and whose vicissitudes are the real theme of history.

The true and correct way to classify the world's civilizations, taking all the periods of history together, is to view them as (1) pagan, (2) Christian. To classify civilizations as Egyptian, Assyrian, Grecian, Roman, German, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Aztec, Peruvian, or by any other method which has respect to such limited and possibly temporary distinctions as nationality, achievement in one or a few special lines of human improvement, or upon any other principle than that which respects the universal and the permanent, may answer the ends of some special inquiry, but is necessarily imperfect and partial. There have been really only two civilizations—pagan and Christian; and with these all history, in its two great divisions of Ancient and Modern, is concerned. Ancient history exhibits the great yet disastrous career of the one. Modern history records the immensely larger and more auspicious growth, and prophesies the sure and glorious destiny, of the other.

The central and decisive element in civilization is religion. That alone which deals with the higher nature of man can so enter into even the life of nations as to result in the kind of growth in which civilization consists. This proposition might be claimed as well-nigh axiomatic; so almost self-evident is it that what constitutes real improvement in the individual is that which alone can improve and elevate the nation or the race. The individual man is never made wise, or moral, or happy by wealth alone, or by material prosperity or advantage of any kind whatsoever; neither, for that very reason, is the race as a whole, or any section of it. To say this is to state a truism. And still it involves a principle which underlies all history; a principle, however, which in the practical life of the world is scarcely remembered at all. And this higher nature in man is a part of him that is unreachd, as to what is most essential in human improvement, even by intellectual culture alone. Strange, indeed, that it should be necessary to so often reiterate the truth that it is only as the moral and the spiritual nature in man is distinctively and effectively made to be at its best, that the man himself is at his best; that only as the race itself has undergone a like transformation will the process of the world's civilization have come to any decisive and permanent result!

Now the pagan civilization has been in certain periods and aspects of it a very admirable thing. The little country described at the beginning of this paper stands worthily as its representative. One may associate with it its mighty suc-

cessor, the Roman state and people, in which appear those sterner and more stalwart elements which are essential in government and in national unity and force. Preceding the Grecian were other forms of civilization, whose monuments along the Nile and the Euphrates have as yet not wholly disappeared, and whose pre-historic achievements are still the puzzle and the wonder of the world. But while these last have ceased to be felt in the march of human progress, and while even Roman law and military art are seldom thought of either as an example or as a lesson, the world feels to this day the effect of Athenian culture, and recognizes it as one of the permanent forces in the growth of civilization. And even before the time of Athenian supremacy Grecian soil had given birth to influences which are more felt, perhaps, to-day than at any period since. There has never been a time when the Homeric age of human history was so profoundly studied as now; and the more it is thus studied the more is it seen how much of the life of that heroic time lived again in what was best in the later history of Greece, and indeed lasts on to the present hour. Will there ever come a time when the philosophy of that later time will cease to instruct the world, its poetry to inspire, its art to kindle?

But always in a pagan civilization, even this of Greece in its best days, one perceives a deficiency that proves in the end to be fatal. Even one who should fail to identify this fatal defect could not fail to be conscious of its existence, even when such civilization is in the glory of its best period. The instructed mind, looking upon it thus in its prime, and even while filled with admiration, is compelled to exclaim, "It is splendid,—but can it last?" One feels, in contemplating it, that after all it must be evanescent. There is a lack of foundation for the stately and gilded fabric. We look for a pure and salutary home-life among the people, and nowhere find it. We look for the people itself, in that sense of the word which, to modern ideas, is the only true one, and we look in vain. A throng of slaves, a body of rude and ignorant artisans in the cities, and peasants in the country, an unwashed crowd in the agora or the forum, swayed hither and thither by the orators, who think for them, and who lead them by inflaming their passions—what are these as the foundation for a state? The temples are glorious as works of art; but the worship there appeals only to superstition, and often to still worse passions. As we look back across the centuries upon the fabric of pagan civilization, we see it shining in a bright eastern sky, with domes and towers glorious in the light of the world's earlier time. But as we draw near, we see that what is beneath, and upon which the whole structure rests, is false, deceptive and decaying. We find that philosophy, poetry and art, even wise laws and great political leaders, do not make a civilization. The temple of Athene, crowning the acropolis at Athens, represents at once the glory and the shame, the triumph and the ruin, of the ancient world. It is glorious as a work of art, and the image of the goddess within is an achievement to which only the genius of Phidias could be equal. Yet as a time would come when processions and victims would cease to visit the Parthenon, so must the time come when a civilization whose only religion was a superstition should have wholly perished from the earth.

Perhaps at no point does the civilization of the modern world so contrast with that of the ancient world, as in that which is at its base and constitutes its foundation. If one were to name that which above every thing else characterizes modern history as a story of human progress, he would surely be right in saying

that it is the birth and growth of a *people*. A government cannot make a civilization; however strong in itself, however splendid in achievement. An aristocracy cannot make a civilization, no matter how ancient or how richly endowed. Neither can schools, nor literatures, nor discoveries in science or philosophy, nor inventions in the useful or the decorative arts. There can be no civilization where there is no people; and the measure and value of the civilization will always be the intelligence, the morality, the social elevation, the general welfare and the happiness of the people. The steady progress of human improvement during the whole period of modern history has been in that direction,—a progress marked by immense vicissitude, with long pauses, with intervals of apparent decline, with explosions of furious elements that seemed at times to threaten universal ruin; yet with progress upon the whole, which, as we look upon it in its result, now seems almost amazing. Exactly at this point the ancient and the modern world are most of all in contrast. To what is it due?

To many causes, undoubtedly. Yet can any person of ordinary intelligence and reflection believe that all would be as we now see it, if the world were to-day filled, as once it was, with heathen temples? What has most of all made this *people* of the nineteenth century, if not their religion? Do you find a people anywhere in the world, save where Christianity is the reigning force? And is not the perfection of this result of generative and formative influence always in proportion as the Christianity which produces it is most truly Christian?

There can therefore be no reason why, in any interest of Christianity, we should undervalue the attainments, in various elements of human progress, made by the pagan nations of antiquity. What man is capable of in one age of the world, other things being equal, he is capable of in any other age. But this qualifying clause *other things being equal* makes a wonderful difference as we come to that which is the real root of the matter. We may claim, therefore, the history of civilization as one of those testimonies for Christianity in which history in general is such a faithful and true witness. Should anyone say that Christian civilization itself has features as bad as any which pagan civilization ever had, or that, in some things, it is worse than paganism ever was, the answer is this: These are no part of any Christian element in the existing condition of the nominal Christian world. They are survivals of that which, where paganism reigns, has full opportunity, and prevails without hindrance. It is so much of the old barbarism still remaining; as in the cultivated field, wild growths, survivals of the old wilderness condition, from time to time re-appear and embarrass the work of the husbandman. The remedy lies, in the one case as in the other, not in criticising or crippling the work of renewal, or in trying to prove that the old wilderness state was after all the best, but in plying with steady industry all the agencies of regeneration.

HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

BY PROF. R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

Theological School, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

I.

A prophet is also a prophecy—just as in some sense the life of the Christian is his best sermon. All prophecies may be thrown into one of two general classes:

1. Verbal Prophecies.
2. Historical Prophecies.

This classification makes the discussion of Old Testament prophecy a discussion of the whole contents of the Old Testament; and so indeed it may properly be—a synonym of Old Testament Theology. In these brief papers, however, we shall use the term prophecy in a more restricted sense.

A verbal prophecy is the oral utterance, whether recorded afterward or not, of Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, or any other person whom Jehovah may choose to make the medium, or vehicle, of his revelation.

An historical prophecy is one expressed in an event, or series of events, rather than in words. In this sense the whole of the Israelitish history is a prophecy in the twofold respect, 1) that it is a course of instruction, 2) that it looks to the future. In this sense the general fact recorded concerning Jonah is a prophecy, though in the other sense the Book of Jonah is not a prophecy. While, however, the history, or life, of Jonah as a whole is a prophecy, it would be straining a point to regard as such every detail of his life. In the second of the above two senses the Jewish classification of the historical books of Joshua, Judges, the Samuels, and Kings, as *Prophetæ Priores* may be justified, though the term derives its chief Jewish significance rather from the place which these books occupy in the canon. But it is noticeable in this connection that the Jews regarded all the Old Testament books, except "the Law," as books of "the prophets."

The prophetic books proper of the Old Testament, including some which are not, strictly speaking, prophetic books, are commonly catalogued under the two classes of

1. The Major Prophets.
2. The Minor Prophets.

The first includes Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. The second includes Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. It is easy to see that this classification has nothing to recommend it, but its popularity. It is Jewish, however, and very ancient. The Talmud omits Daniel from the list of "greater prophets," and the Hebrew canon places his book among the *K'thubim*, or Writings. Augustine several times in "The City of God" recognizes this classification as one well known in his day. An obviously better one, it would seem, is the chronological, whether the subject of study be the contents or the language of the prophecies. The following arrangement is substantially the one proposed by Van Til, a Dutch writer and professor at Leyden in the early part of the eighteenth century:

1. The prophets of Judah and Israel to the time of the overthrow of the latter, B. C. 721. This list includes Jonah, Amos, Joel and Hosea.

2. The prophets of Judah from the overthrow of Israel to the final overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 586. This list includes Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk and Zephaniah.

3. The prophets of the captivity, B. C. 586 to B. C. 516. Ezekiel and Daniel.

4. The prophets of the restoration. Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

Of course, the line of separation between these periods must not be too rigidly drawn, as in each case one period more or less overlaps another. Isaiah's ministry, for example, probably began in the first period, and Jeremiah's ended in the third. The prophetic books of each of these groups should be studied, of course, in connection with the history of the periods to which they respectively belong. No one of them can be studied well, either in respect to its subject-matter or its diction, if it be studied independently of its chronology and historical surroundings—though it is also true that the study of the diction exclusively, or the subject-matter exclusively, may help to determine the chronology.

The sixteen prophets above mentioned cover a period of four hundred years, beginning about five hundred and fifty years after the settlement in Canaan, and extending to about B. C. 400. This would seem to be a small ministry for so long a period of time and for so "stiff-necked" a people. It was a small ministry, and an unsuccessful one,—counting success after the manner of men. It was a small number, even after making due allowance for those who wrote nothing, as Elijah and Elisha, and for the still larger number whose names are not even mentioned. Many of these were unworthy to be called prophets, because they were "false," and many of the remainder were doubtless inefficient. The Prophetical Colleges in those days could make neither heart nor brains. And as for supernatural endowments, God was much more likely to inspire a man who had a basis of natural gifts with which to begin. Not every young Hebrew who attended the Prophetical Schools, and had the diploma, and wore the uniform of the order, was capable of being inspired. Not every prophet in Israel was an inspired prophet. Many were prophets only in the sense that they belonged to the order; some in a little higher sense; others in a lower. The Elijahs, Isaiahs and Jeremiahs, if distributed evenly along the course of prophetic history, would scarcely furnish two for each century. But these were enough. Not many generals are needed. John Huss, Savonarola and Luther were few among many. Samuel stood alone in his day.

But how did there happen to be a prophetical order? for it can scarcely be doubted that there was one. It was not distinctly provided for, or contemplated, in the original Mosaic economy, any more than was the monarchical form of government.

To the sacerdotal order was originally entrusted the function of teacher and governor of the people in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical. Doubtless they also were originally the physicians and teachers of the secular schools, in so far as there were any. Did they not adequately fulfill the task assigned them? Not long. A few score years, at most, was as long as they did their work *adequately*. With neglect of duty and corrupt practices the priesthood was soon reduced to a low condition. Then Samuel was raised up, but whether he was himself a Levite remains a disputed point. It is probable that he was. He was a prophet, and established the Prophetical Order. He founded the first Prophetical School, and these were similar in constitution and purpose to our Theological Schools. They studied music, and poetry, and the Law. They became the teachers of the people,

the politicians, the annalists and historians, the physicians, the conservators of patriotism, morals, and spiritual religion. They wore a kind of uniform, and could be identified as prophets at sight. They had nothing to do with the functions of the priests, but were even more influential than the priests. Kings both respected and feared them. They were a numerous class. Obadiah concealed one hundred at a time from the wrath of Jezebel, an unknown number having already been cut off by her. Ahab king of Israel gathered together four hundred prophets of the Lord, and there was doubtless a larger number in both Israel and Judah in quieter times. But not all who belonged to the prophetic order had the prophetic gift. The majority of them doubtless were without it. Nor was there always agreement among them. So far, indeed, did some differ from others in their views and teachings as justly to entitle them to be called "false" prophets. The condition of the government and of the people was generally such as to call forth much difference of opinion as to matters both of public policy and private morals. But however honest in their views the false ones may have been, they were guilty. They had influence enough to lead the nation to ruin. Their predictions were merely forecastings. Though all claimed to be "seers," comparatively few of the prophetic order were inspired. Some priests, and others who did not belong to this order, were inspired. The whole number making up the inspired list from the close of Solomon's reign to the time of Malachi is about twenty-seven, and extends over a period of about five hundred and fifty years. Besides those mentioned above, their names are Shemaiah, Ahijah, Azariah, Hanani, Jehaziel, Jehu, Eliezer, Micaiah, Zechariah (?) (2 Chron. xxiv. 20), Zechariah (2 Chron. xxvi. 5), Oded (?). It is not expressly stated, however, that the first Zechariah and Oded were inspired. None of the other seers, or prophets, or "teachers in Israel," were in any respect superior in endowments or acquirements to our modern clergy. It is probable that even these twenty-seven were not permanently endowed with the spirit of inspiration. "The word of the Lord" came to them at such times as he saw it was wise and needful thus to communicate with them.

But it was not the duty of the prophetic class, whether inspired or uninspired, merely to teach and preach. It was a part of their duty, and a very important part, to make a record of the Divine utterances, and thus provide for their permanent existence; and in doing this they were guarded by the Holy Spirit from error. It is probable that not only the prophetic books strictly so called, but also the historical books, were written by men who belonged to the prophetic order; so that these historical books may well be called books of the prophets, as they actually are called in the Hebrew Bibles. The written prophecies, in the narrower sense of the term, are records, whether made by the men who originally spoke them, or not, of the revelations of Jehovah to the men selected by him to make known his will to his chosen people. And these prophecies were not merely of local and temporary value. The will of God is the same, under the same circumstances, in all ages and nations; and besides this, the Jew as well as the Christian, of all subsequent times, may see in the fulfillment of the predictions which occur in prophecy a proof that the Bible is in all respects what it pretends to be.

The darkest period of the Hebrew political history was the most brilliant period of Hebrew prophecy. The national sins, and confusions, and defeats, and exiles became the best occasion of its rise and development. Had there been no clouds there had been no rainbows. Prophecy brought to the people a larger hope

of the resurrection both in the national and in the individual, or personal, sense of the term; and the root of this hope lay in the gloom of the present. It is only night that can make us think of morning. Prophecy also brought a larger anticipation of judgment after death. While it did not displace Mosaism, it became its consummation and fulfillment, and, by placing the greater emphasis on the spiritual nature of God's requirements, prepared the way for the ultimate abolition of ritual and symbol. While the prophets never for a moment lose sight of the national identity, and are ever jealous of it, they do ere long mount the partition wall between Israel and the Gentiles, and proclaim a kingdom of God, which, having its center at Jerusalem shall embrace even the Gentile nations, and permeate them with its benign influence. This, however, leads us into Messianic prophecy, the chief glory of Israel's most brilliant prophetic age; and it was the failure on the part of the Jews to rightly apprehend it that so largely influenced their treatment of Jesus, and consequently the whole contents of the New Testament.



THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

THE BOOKS OF GENESIS AND EXODUS.

The Lessons for the first half of the year 1887 are from these books. It is safe to say that a somewhat thoughtful and scholarly study of the books will be made, during that half year, by many more persons than ever previously made a similar study in any six months of the earth's history.

In actual work with ordinary Sunday-school classes, it would be a mistake for teachers to call much attention to the disputed critical questions concerning these books. Sunday-school work should be distinctively religious, and mere critical discussions are very dry husks for the feeding of the religious life. From the point of view of even the worst possible theory of the origin of these books, their more salient and important religious teachings are unassailed and unassailable. One need not settle the critical questions, in order to establish his right to rest upon the spiritual truths. In what they teach their scholars, most Sunday-school workers will do well to confine themselves pretty closely to these truths. But in making our preparations for teaching, it is well for us, if we can, to study the critical questions. We should need this, were there no other reason, to save ourselves from repeating the thousand traditional mistakes that are currently repeated along with the truths in these books, as if they were a part of the truths themselves. We need it too, in order to be prepared to answer questions and meet difficulties. It is known, not to a few merely, but to the million, that very many scholars of unimpeachable eminence hold that the Pentateuch was written, not by Moses, but many centuries after his death; and that many such scholars also hold that these books are not credible as history. A Sunday-school teacher is liable, at any time, to have questions of this sort sprung upon him; it will increase his usefulness, if he is prepared to meet them.

The first five books of the Old Testament have commonly been spoken of as the Books of Moses; they are so spoken of in the New Testament. This has gen-

erally been understood to mean that Moses was, in some fair sense of the term, the author of them. It is perfectly fair, however, to raise the question whether tradition has not been misled in this matter. It is entirely supposable that the books may originally have been called the Books of Moses because they brought up the history of the world to the time of Moses, and because he is the most prominent character in the books, without any intention of indicating thereby that he was their author; and that, in fact, they may have been written at some later period. If any one could maintain this hypothesis by arguments that did not impeach the truthfulness of the Scriptures, no believer in the doctrine of inspiration need find fault with him. As a matter of fact, however, the best known attempts to prove the late origin of the Pentateuch are made by men who disbelieve in the historicity of the records. It is this especially that gives importance to the matter: the question whether God's revelation to men has been made through the medium of actual history, rather than through the medium of a series of religious legends. is a question of no mean importance.

The critics who attack the received view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch start from such facts as the following: Evidently, the Book of Genesis gives us at least two accounts of the creation. Further, this book, and that of Exodus, give duplicate accounts of a good many of the events which they mention. Between these various pairs of accounts there are differences of vocabulary, of syntax, of mode of conception in regard to the facts narrated. Notably, for example, the first account in Genesis uniformly calls the Supreme Being *Elohim*; the second calls him *Jehovah Elohim*, with some variations. From this difference, the first account is called Elohistic, and the second Jehovistic, though some other differences between them are regarded as even more important than this. These differences seem to indicate that we have here what were originally separate pieces of composition, which have been united in the making of the records we now have.

To this extent, it seems to me that critics are evidently in the right. Large portions of the Old Testament have been composed, in part, from previously existing compositions. Those who defend the views commonly received make a mistake when they deny or ignore the marks which indicate that any particular passage is composite.

Formerly it was held that the Elohistic parts of Genesis and Exodus were earlier than the Jehovistic parts; at present the reverse is confidently affirmed. An average view of the matter is that Genesis and the first thirty-four chapters of Exodus were made by putting together sections of three different previous works, two of them Elohistic and one Jehovistic, each of which was substantially a history of the whole period. Each of these works, it is claimed, had been rewritten one or more times; the first two were combined by one editor, and this composite work afterward joined to the third by another editor, both editors making changes and additions. The attempt to prove such a theory as this, from such phenomena as are found in these books, seems to me like the attempt to make two straight lines inclose a surface. To do this is very different from showing that our present books were partly drawn from previous written sources of some sort. But it is no easier to disprove some parts of these theories than to prove them; either for proof or for disproof, the evidence is, in the nature of things, indecisive.

Supposably, however, one might hold to this analysis of the two books without denying that they originated in the times of Moses, and under his influence

and without at all impeaching the divine character of the books. But men like Kuenen and Wellhausen do not hold to it in any such way. As an average view of the matter, they hold that the oldest of the three documents is mainly a collection of legends connected with the sanctuaries of northern Israel, with some other traditions, and including the civil code found in Exod. xxi.—xxiii.; and that this was written a generation or two before the times of Amos and Hosea. They hold that the second document was another similar collection, made in the times of those prophets, or a little later; this second document included the Ten Commandments. The third document, they say, was written in Babylonia, in Ezra's time, the whole being put together at some later date. It seems to me that these allegations are not merely unproved by the facts in the case, but disproved. Yet he who would be prepared to meet difficulties as they arise should have at least a general knowledge of the opinions of this sort that are more or less current.

JAN. 2, 1887. THE BEGINNING. Gen. i. 26-31 and ii. 1-3.

The critics just mentioned regard Gen. i. and ii. 1-3 as part of the later of the two Elohistic works just mentioned—the work written in Ezra's time. They admit that Ezra proclaimed this work as ancient; that its Hebrew differs from the known Hebrew of the times of Ezra; that the Books of Chronicles, and occasionally the Books of Kings, presuppose its existence far back in the history; that it is quoted or referred to in the Psalms ascribed to David, in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets, and in the earlier documents of the Hexateuch (notably, for example, in Exod. xx. 11), and a long list of other similar facts. They harmonize these facts with their opinion by the hypotheses that what Ezra proclaimed was a legal fiction; that for this reason it was written in archaic style; that the author of Chronicles was mistaken; that the Books of Kings, the prophetic writings, and the Ten Commandments have been subjected to interpolations; that the Davidic Psalms were written several centuries later than David; and the like. Surely one may be pardoned if he fails of being convinced by such reasoning.

Three or four words, or special uses of words, in this first account of the creation, call for attention. In the case of words that have so extensive a use as have *bara* and *raqi'a*, the meaning should be ascertained by the usage, and not by speculation or by etymological conjecture. *Bara* in the Qal and Niphal is uniformly used of divine origination, as distinguished from origination by second causes. In the lexicons a few exceptions are taken to this statement; but an examination of the passages will show that they are mistaken. The origination may sometimes be from pre-existing materials; the man and woman are both said to have been created (Gen. i. 27), though one was made from dust, and the other from the side of the man. The origination may be the product of a series of second causes, as undoubtedly was the case with the Ammonite, Ezek. xxi. 30 (35). But in such cases the origination is conceived of, not as wrought by second causes, but simply as a divine act. Probably this idea of a characteristic divine origination does not differ essentially from the scholastic idea of creation from nothing, when the latter is correctly defined; but perhaps theology would lose nothing if it should substitute the biblical form of the idea for the scholastic. In any case, nothing depends on the conjectural etymologies of *bara*, whether the root-idea be that of carving, as the lexicons make it, or be something different.

Raqi'a, the lexicons say, is derived from the idea of beating, and hence of expanding metals into thin plates by beating, and therefore denotes a sort of sheet-iron sky, or something of that kind. This is mostly an importation into Hebrew of the ideas of some other language. The *raqi'a*, as defined in Genesis i. 7, 8, is the whole open space bounded by the earth-surface below and the apparent sky-surface above; it is not the mere sky-surface itself, conceived of as solid. The expansion by beating which the lexicons connect with this root is purely conjectural; the words of this stem are applied to the earth as well as to the sky: the Hebrew poets think of the outspread sky-surface as textile, rather than as metallic, "as a tent to dwell in" for example. See Isa. XL. 22; XLII. 5; XLIV. 24, etc.

It is currently alleged that the Hebrew has no plural of majesty, and therefore that the use of the plural *Elohim* for God, and the use of the plural verb and pronouns "we will make man in our image," etc., in Gen. i. 26, are traces of polytheism in the religion of Israel. To these instances should be added that of the plural *Adhonay*, the usual substitute for the name Jehovah. These same facts are used by an entirely different class of persons as legitimate proofs of the doctrine of the trinity. The fact that *Elohim* usually and *Adhonay* always have their verbs and adjectives in the singular is discouraging to those who seek here a polytheistic meaning, and rather encouraging to those who seek the doctrine of one God in three persons. But as a matter of fact, the nouns *adon* and *ba'al* are currently used in Hebrew in the plural, when they denote only one person, in the case of human masters as well as in the case of divine names. In 2 Chron. xxv. 16, we are told that Amaziah said to the prophet, "Have we given thee for counselor to the king? For thy part, desist; why should they smite thee?" Here the king speaks of himself as "we." In view of the existence of these instances, there is a good deal of risk in regarding *Elohim* and *Adhonay* as any thing more than plurals of excellence. And doubtless every one will reach the same conclusion in regard to the plurals in Gen. i. 26 that he reaches in regard to these proper names.

This first account of the Creation consists of a few selected facts concerning the divine origination of the universe, in the mnemonic form of a sketch of a week's work of God, written mainly for the purpose of impressing two great religious truths, namely, the supremacy of the divine creator, and the sanctity of the Sabbath. The selection of the facts, the classification of them, and the order of statement are those required by the mnemonic form and the religious purpose of the account. That it is a statement of facts and not a myth is evident, even if there were no other proof, from the many agreements between the account and the best authenticated results reached by science. But as this author has not undertaken to state all the facts in the case, nor to state them in scientific order, or with scientific classification, he cannot, for any failures of this kind, be charged with contradicting science. The six days belong to the mnemonic form of the narrative, and do not necessarily give us any information as to the time actually employed in the several creative processes described. From what we know of the facts in the case, we know that the order of the days is essentially that in which the successive processes occurred, though, in some instances, one of the processes described as a creative day must have overlapped one or more of the others. In fine, a man who believes this account to be inspired should feel himself to be beyond the necessity of asking how it may be reconciled with science,

and should rather be asking science to help him fill up the outlines of the sketch, and thus interpret it.

Among the commentaries on Genesis and Exodus with which I happen to be familiar, the *Pulpit Commentary* is the best, on the whole, for average American Sunday-school teachers. In the Introductions to this work, and in other parts of it, may be found pretty good popular accounts, written from an orthodox point of view, of the various critical controversies. A more full and complete account of the history and literature of these controversies is to be found in the article of Dr. Charles A. Briggs in the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1883, and in the series of articles that preceded and followed it. The best presentation, in English, of the views of the dominant school of destructive criticism is probably the translation of Kuenen's *Hexateuch*, published in 1886. The Old Testament articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* are of the same school. On the other side, Dr. E. C. Bissell's *Pentateuch* is perhaps the most complete refutation that has been published in English. The little book of Dr. Rufus P. Stebbins is more readable than most such books: Works of value on the Pentateuch have been published by Dr. Wm. H. Green and Dr. Charles Elliott. There is a full treatment of the subject in Dr. Henry M. Harman's *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*. Add to these, review articles and articles in commentaries and books of reference, almost without number. The literature of the subject is pretty exhaustively treated in the article of Dr. Briggs, mentioned above, and the book of Dr. Bissell has a very full literary list.

The best work I have met on the biblical account of the creation is *The Week of Creation*, by George Warrington, published in London by Macmillan & Co., in 1870. Principal Dawson's *Origin of the World* combines the geological record with the biblical. Dr. S. M. Campbell's *Story of Creation* is good. On this subject, I know of few passages better worth reading than the fourth chapter of Dr. Newman Smyth's *Old Faiths in New Lights*, especially pages 142-153. Other works on the subject are numerous, and some of them able.

BOOK-STUDY : GENESIS (PART I.).

BY THE EDITOR.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. "Genesis" has been chosen for our next "Book-Study," because it is soon to form the basis of work in the International Sunday-school Lessons; and also, because repeated requests have been received from Bible-students that this book be taken up in this manner.

2. No book in the canon makes such demands of the interpreter as does the Book of Genesis. The subjects of which it treats cover the whole domain of knowledge. Of every department of learning, the "beginnings" are contained in this book. No book, therefore, is more deserving of thorough study; and certainly, if nothing more can be done, its contents may be learned.

3. Our aim in this work is a definite one: viz., to lead the student to investigate for himself some of the problems here presented. We cannot take up every thing that belongs legitimately to the book. We may, however, suggest an outline the carrying out of which will lead to some practical results.

4. For use in this work the following books are recommended :—

- a. *Dod's Book of Genesis*, with Introduction and Notes;* brief and to the point, giving the results of the latest investigation, accepting the composite authorship of the book.
- b. *Pulpit Commentary : Genesis*.† Expositions and Homiletics by Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M. A. ; presenting clearly the most important views with the arguments pro and con.
- c. *Geikie's Hours with the Bible*, vol. I.‡
- d. *Lenormant's The Beginnings of History*, according to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples.§ This is fresh and interesting, but not always trustworthy.
- e. The articles on the various topics in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*.||
- f. Much help can also be obtained from such standard works as *Lange's Genesis*,¶ *Kalisch's Genesis*,‡ *Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant*.§

5. References are given only to those books which are supposed to be in the hands of nearly every Bible-student. The articles and passages referred to themselves contain other references which those who so desire may study.

6. The book will be treated in two "Studies," the first covering Genesis I.—XI., the second Genesis XII.—L.

7. The General Remarks of previous "Studies" are applicable, as well, to this "Study."

II. DIRECTIONS.

1. Master the *contents* of Genesis I.—XI., according to the following plan :—

- a. *Read carefully* each chapter, noting its main thought, and its connection with the preceding and following chapters.
- b. *Write out* on a slip of paper the topic, or topics, of which each chapter treats; study these topics, until each at once suggests to the mind the details included under it, and until the *number* of the chapter suggests both the topic and the details.
- c. *Analyze*** this division: Select say five or six important topics, under which and in connection with which you can arrange all the material.
- d. *Index* this division: Make a list of important persons, places, events or objects; e. g., Adam, Cain, Noah, Terah, Eden, Creation, Deluge; and connect with each name, in the order narrated, the statements relating to it.
- e. *Read again* the chapters of the division, (1) correcting and verifying the work done thus far; (2) seeking, especially, to fasten in mind the logical connection of the various chapters.

2. Study the *chronology* of Genesis I.—XI.:

- a. Get clearly fixed in mind the so-called accepted chronology as commonly given; this will serve as a starting-point.

* In Series of Hand-Books for Bible-Classes. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

† A. D. F. Randolph & Son, New York.

‡ James Pott & Co., New York.

§ Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

|| Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

¶ This may be picked up in second-hand book-stores; or it may be imported.

** Pay no attention to the analyses given in commentaries; make your own. Avoid particularly those analyses which are made upon the basis of the introductory formula "These are the generations," etc.

- b. Compare the varying chronologies* given by the Hebrew text, the Septuagint version, the Samaritan Pentateuch and Josephus, and explain, if possible, these variations.
3. Consider some of the more important *general topics* brought up in this division:†
- a. *The relation of the account of creation, given in the opening chapters, to the account given by science*:‡ (1) What was the object of the writer of Gen. i., what was he trying to show? (2) In what respects does the order of creation here given differ from that taught by science? (3) Is there anything to favor the view that the author was really regardless of scientific accuracy? (4) Is there anything to favor the view that this first chapter is a *poem*, and to be interpreted as *poetry*?§ (5) What light is thrown on the question by other cosmogonies?|| (6) What, in particular, is the connection of the Babylonian account of creation? (7) Did the people for whom the account was first written, understand the "day" to be one of twenty-four hours? (8) What is the view prevailing among Christian scientists?¶
- b. *The two accounts of Creation*: (1) What is the fact concerning the use of the divine names in the first and second chapters?** (2) Concerning the differences of style and language between i.-ii. 4 and ii. 5-25? (3) Concerning the alleged discrepancies between the two accounts? (4) The explanation of these facts, so far as they exist, on the supposition that there is but *one* account? (5) The view which makes *two* accounts?††
- c. *The Garden of Eden*:‡‡ (1) The biblical statements? (2) The various problems? (3) The allegorical interpretation? (4) The mythical interpretation? (5) The historical interpretation? (6) The more important of the theories which have been held? (7) The view of Friedrich Delitzsch?

* See Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Chronology*; and various commentaries on ch. v.

† The first eleven chapters of Genesis cover more ground, and present more difficult questions than all that remains of the entire Old Testament. For the *satisfactory* study of the great problems here presented omniscience would be required. It is nevertheless our duty to study them and to find, so far as it is possible to find, a solution of these difficulties. Much will remain doubtful; much, nevertheless, may be ascertained. Only directions of the most general character can here be given.

‡ See Dod, Genesis. Introduction, pp. xlv-xxii; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. IV.

§ See OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. III., No. 8.

|| See *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. III.; *Lenormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. I.

¶ These are a few of the questions for which the general student should seek an answer. Scores of books, most of them worthless, have been written on this subject. A most satisfactory statement will be found in *Guyot's Creation*, or the Biblical Cosmogony in the light of Modern Science. *Chas. Scribner's Sons*, New York. See also what Prof. Beecher says on p. 113 of this number.

** The question of the composite authorship of Genesis, or any other book, is one chiefly of *fact*. Assertions are made as to the existence of certain facts. Now the thing to do is not to argue that these facts cannot, for certain reasons, be supposed to exist; but to show that they *actually do not exist*. On the supposition, however, that the facts do exist, the inferences which destructive critics draw from them may be rejected. We may, each one, interpret the facts according to our own ideas. But why should we discuss the interpretation of them, before we have examined into the case and made up our minds as to their existence or non-existence?

†† See Prof. Schodde's article in this number; as well as the commentaries *in loco*.

‡‡ See *Delitzsch*, *Wo lag das Paradies*; also the article by Prof. Francis Brown in OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. IV., No. 1; Brit. Encyc., article on *Adam*; Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Eden*; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, vol. I., ch. VIII.; Commentaries on Gen. ii.

- d. *The first sin*:* (1) The biblical statement? (2) The allegorical, mythical and historical interpretations? (3) The view which makes it a "combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative presentation of an actual event"? (4) The serpent, a symbol of sin? (5) The various traditions of this "sin" handed down among other nations? (6) The relative value of these traditions, as compared with the biblical account? (7) The origin of these traditions and the bearing of this on the biblical account?
- e. *The Cherubim and the flaming sword*:† (1) The biblical passages in which reference is made to cherubim? (2) The form which the biblical writers supposed them to have? (3) The cherub (kirubu) among the Assyrians? (4) Parallels in other mythologies? (5) What did the cherubim symbolize? (6) The flaming sword?
- f. *Cain and his family*:‡ (1) The significance of the story of Abel's murder? (2) Similar stories among ancient nations? (3) The punishment of Cain? (4) The names of Cain's descendants compared with those of Seth? (5) Lamech's family? (6) This account of the origin of arts as compared with that of other ancient nations? (7) The interpretation of Lamech's song? (8) The two important items contained in verses 25, 26 (ch. IV.)?
- g. *The Descendants of Adam through Seth*:§ (1) Make out a tabular list of the names; (2) write in parallel columns the descendants of Adam through Cain, placing Cain opposite Cainan; (3) note the similarities in the names, the differences, also the differences in the meaning of the names, the interchange of Enoch, that in both cases the last name branches into three (Jabal, Jubal, Tubal, and Shem, Ham, Japheth), the part played by the numbers three, seven, ten; (4) compare the parallel usage of ancient nations in speaking of ten primitive kings, heroes, or demi-gods; (5) explanations offered for these facts; (6) variations between the ancient versions in the numbers of this chapter; (7) the purpose of these genealogies; (8) the general impression they convey.
- h. *The longevity of the antediluvians*:|| (1) Traditions among ancient nations in reference to longevity? (2) The opinions of scientists as to the probability or possibility of this? (3) Various interpretations to evade the difficulty? (4) Considerations to be urged in favor of accepting the statements as literally true?
- i. *The Sons of God and the daughters of men*:¶ (1) Various interpretations of these terms? (2) Arguments for and against the view that intercourse of "angels" and women is referred to? (3) Arguments for and against the view that "sons of God" = the Sethites, the pious race? (4) Parallels in ancient mythologies? (5) Giants in Scripture? (6) The meaning of the

* See, besides previous references, *Lenormant*, *Beginnings of History*, ch. II.; *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, *Serpent*; *Commentaries in loco*.

† *Lenormant*, *Beginnings of History*, ch. III.; *Encyc. Brit.*; *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, *Cherubim*; *Commentaries in loco*.

‡ *Commentaries in loco*; *Lenormant*, *Beginnings of History*, ch. IV.; *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, *Cain and Abel*.

§ *Commentaries in loco*; *Lenormant*, *Beginnings of History*, ch. V.; *Geikie*, *Hours with the Bible*, vol. I., ch. XII.

|| *Pulpit Commentary*, on Gen. v. 5; *Lange's Genesis*; *Kalisch's Genesis*, pp. 158-161; *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, under *Patriarch*; *Kurtz*, *Hist. of O. C.*, Vol. I., pp. 93, 94.

¶ *Commentaries in loco*; *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, under *Noah*, pp. 2175-2177; *Kurtz*, *Hist. of O. C.* Vol. I., pp. 96-109. *Lenormant*, *Beginnings of History*, ch. VII.

expression "My spirit shall not strive with man forever"? (7) Meaning of "their days shall be a hundred and twenty years"? (8) The "repenting" of God? (9) The destruction of animals with man? (10) The view that would make this entire narrative a myth?

- j. *The Deluge*:* (1) The ark (a) the word, (b) material, (c) plan, (d) size, (e) shape, (f) purpose of construction, (g) the possibility of its containing all that was intended to go in it? (2) The universality of the deluge, (a) authorities for and against, (b) arguments for and against? (3) Duration of the Deluge? (4) The exact meaning of the language employed in the description? (5) Allusions to the Deluge in later biblical literature? (6) The Babylonian account of the Deluge? (7) Traditions among other nations? (8) The events immediately following the flood? (9) The precise object of the flood?
- k. *Noah's Curse*:† (1) The immediate occasion of the utterance of these words? (2) Is it a prayer or a prophecy? (3) The words concerning Canaan? (4) Why was Canaan cursed instead of Ham? (5) The words concerning Shem? (6) Concerning Japheth? (7) The various interpretations of the line "and let him dwell in the tents of Shem"? (8) The Messianic element in this passage? (9) Its fulfillment?
- l. *The Table of Nations*:‡ (1) For what reason is this list of nations of special value? (2) Are the names given those of individuals or of nations? (3) Are the nations presented according to their racial affinities, or according to the geographical location of their territories? (4) The identification, as far as it is possible, of those mentioned as "sons of Japheth"? (5) Of the "sons of Ham"? (6) What is to be understood from the narrative concerning "Nimrod"? (7) Identification of the "sons of Mizraim"? (8) Of the "sons of Canaan"? (9) Of the "sons of Shem"? (10) Of the "sons of Joktan"? (11) Make out a map showing the facts of this table. (12) What were the occasions, the manners and the order of the great human migrations? (13) What are the scientific tests of racial affinity?
- m. *The tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues*:§ (1) Identification of this tower with the temple of Birs-Nimroud at Borsippa? (2) The rebuilding of this temple by Nebuchadnezzar? (3) The relation between the narrative of the "confusion of tongues" and the "table of nations"? (4) Origin of differences of language according to philology? (5) To what extent does philology favor the view that one language was once spoken by all men? (6) Does this narrative teach that the differences existing between languages are due to a miraculous interposition on the part of Jehovah? (7) What was the sin of the tower-builders? (8) What traditions concerning the confusion of tongues exist among other ancient nations? (9) Advantages and disadvantages attending the existing variety of languages? (10) The im-

* Commentaries *in loco*; Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Noah*, pp. 2177-2187; *LeNormant*, Beginnings of History, ch. VIII., with appendix V.; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible I., chaps. XIII., XIV.; *Encyc. Brit.*, article *Deluge*, by T. K. Cheyne.

† Commentaries *in loco*.

‡ Commentaries on Gen. X.; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, I., chaps. XV., XVI.; Smith's Bible Dictionary on the various names which occur; and on *Shemitic Languages*: G. Rawlinson, Origin of Nations (Chas. Scribner's Sons).

§ Commentaries *in loco*; Smith's Bible Dictionary, under *Tongues*, *Confusion of*, and *Tower of Babel*; *Geikie*, Hours with the Bible, I., chap. XVII.; *Kurtz*, Hist. of O. T. Vol. I., pp. 108-122.

portance of this event in the history of the divine plan of redemption?

- n. *The descendants of Shem*:* (1) The numbers three and ten? (2) The variations between the figures of the Hebrew text and those of the Septuagint? (3) The family of Terah? (4) Ur of the Chaldees? (5) The reasons for Abram's migrations?
- o. *The double account of the deluge*:† (1) Study comparatively the following arrangement of the chapters and verses describing the deluge, and, if possible, the accompanying references to the cuneiform tablets containing the Babylonian account:

Ch. VI. 11, 12	VI. 5-8	I. 11-16
13, 14	VII. 1	17-23
15, 16	—	24-27
—	—	28-35
17, 18	4	36-38
19-21	2, 3	39-44
—	—	45-52
22	5	II. 2-24
VII. 6; 11-16	7-9	25-34
—	16b	35-39
18-20	10; 12, 17	40-50
21, 22	23	III. 1-4
—	—	5-18
24	—	19, 20
VIII. 1; 2a; 3b	VIII. 2b; 3a	21-23
—	—	24-31
4	—	32-36
5; 13a, 14	6-12	37-44
15-17	—	—
18, 19	13b	45a
—	20	45b-50
IX. 1-11	—	—
12-16	—	51, 52
17	—	—
—	—	53
—	—	IV. 1-11
—	21, 22	12-20
—	—	21, 22
—	—	23-30

- (2) Note any differences which may seem to exist between the two biblical accounts in reference to (a) the use of the divine names; (β) the beasts which Noah is commanded to take with him into the ark; (γ) the time during which the waters prevailed.
- (3) Note the details omitted in each of the biblical accounts, and supplied by the other, as well as the additional details in the Babylonian account.
- (4) Is there any perceptible difference in the style and language of the two biblical accounts?
- (5) What evidence does the Babylonian account furnish for or against the existence of a double biblical account?
- (6) What explanation of these apparent repetitions, and differences and discrepancies, may be offered which will render the hypothesis of a double account unnecessary?‡

Remark.—Other important topics must be omitted for lack of space. The second division of Genesis will be taken up in the next number of THE STUDENT.

* Commentaries *in loco*.

† This arrangement is taken from *Lenormant, Beginnings of History*, chap. VIII. In this book, pp. 1-45, will be found Gen. i.-xi. translated, and printed in such a manner as to show the alleged different accounts. Foot-notes also are given indicating the difficult points in the analysis. The Babylonian account is given in full in Appendix V. The latter will also be found in *George Smith's Chaldean account of Genesis*, chap. XVI. (Chas. Scribner's Sons).

‡ This topic has been given because the writer is firmly of the opinion that it is the duty of the Bible-student to acquaint himself with the *facts in the case*. The question for each one to settle is: Do these alleged facts exist? And it can only be settled by a personal investigation.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

In the November "Notes and Notices," the name of the Instructor in Hebrew in Cambridge (Mass.) Episcopal Divinity School was given as M. Lindsay Kellun. It should have been M. Lindsay Kellner.

At the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, the faculty has been requested by quite a large number of students to make provision for instruction in Hebrew. It is difficult to see how this request can reasonably be refused. This great University of the West furnishes instruction in almost every subject which may be mentioned. Why should Hebrew be omitted? This question is especially pertinent, in view of the demand which has been made by her students, and in view of the fact that other institutions, East and West, are establishing Semitic chairs.

The Young Men's Hebrew Association, of Philadelphia, offers a prize of fifty dollars for the best essay on the following topic: "The principles of Ethics in the sayings in the Book of Proverbs, with an inquiry into the social conditions which they reflect." The choice of the subject appears to be a particularly happy one; and it is only to be hoped that the rather formidable title will deter no one from competing. Of course, the more knowledge the better; but the subject is by no means one that requires special erudition to be well handled. The Association, we understand, does not expect learned treatises (though, of course, it will be happy to receive such); but a popular treatment of the subject. A careful study of the Proverbs themselves, with the aid of the most important works bearing on the subject, is all the preparation a person of intelligence and good education requires in order to write something which, even if it does not gain the prize, will reflect credit upon the writer.

Notice has already been given of the special course in Assyriology, to be given at Baltimore, during January, by Professor Paul Haupt, Ph. D. The regular Semitic courses will be interrupted for this period, and all the time devoted to Assyriology. Professor Haupt will teach daily from 3 to 4 o'clock P. M., giving a series of introductory lectures on Assyrian Grammar and interpreting selected cuneiform texts, principally those bearing upon the Old Testament. Besides the classes of Professor Haupt, individual instruction will be given three or four hours daily by the Fellows of Semitic Languages. Students are recommended to familiarize themselves with the elements of the cuneiform syllabary. No tuition-fee will be charged. Professors and students of other institutions, as well as clergymen, are invited to attend. Accommodations may be secured for five or six dollars a week. Surely this is an opportunity of which everyone for whom it is possible should avail himself.

The *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* is at hand. To the Secretary, Professor H. G. Mitchell, of Boston University, much credit is due for the neat and accurate form in which it is published. Old Testament students will be interested in the papers on "Worship of the Tabernacle compared with that of the Second Temple," by Dr. S. J. Andrews; on "Rain-fall in Palestine,"

by Dr. E. W. Rice; on "The Asaph-Psalms," by Dr. C. H. Toy, and on "Jacob's Blessing," by Dr. Jno. P. Peters. One of the most valuable items in the *Journal*, is the note of Dr. E. C. Bissell, on the passage Zech. vi. 1-7. The work of the Society grows with each year. Its winter meeting is held in New York City, during the holidays.

During the month of January, 1887, the work of the students in the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, of Morgan Park, Ill., will be almost exclusively in the line of the Old Testament. Five Courses of lectures will be delivered by Professor Harper. *One*, on Hebrew Syntax, in which selected texts will be studied with reference to the syntactical principles which they illustrate; a *second*, on Isaiah XL.-LXVI., in which, besides the translation of the Hebrew text, there will be taken up the interpretation of the most important passages, and the study of the division as a whole, in the manner outlined by Professor Ballantine in the October STUDENT; a *third*, on Messianic Prophecies and Prophecy; a *fourth*, on the Post-Exilic Prophets; and a *fifth*, on the Books of Genesis, Exodus and Deuteronomy, in which these books will be studied as distinct books. Each Course will include twenty lectures.

The quickened interest in Old Testament study is particularly noticeable in certain Southern States and in Canada. There are data for the statement that the renewal of interest in Old Testament work among the ministers of these sections is becoming quite general. It is sincerely to be hoped that this growing interest may continue, until the last shelf-deposited, dust-covered, neglected Hebrew Bible shall have been put into vigorous use.

In the great International Oriental Congress held recently, in Vienna, Austria, the various departments met in separate sections.

"In the Semitic section there were only three papers that had special interest for students of the Bible. The Rev. C. J. Ball, of London, read a paper upon 'Hebrew Poetry,' advocating a theory which is essentially the same as that of Professor Bickell—namely, that lines of Hebrew poetry are measured by definite numbers of syllables. He was stoutly supported by Professor Bickell, but found no other support. What direction the discussion might have taken was difficult to determine. It was strangely interrupted by one of the Vienna Orientalists, who interjected remarks upon the Hebrew tenses which had nothing whatever to do with the subject. He was allowed to complete his talk, and the discussion came to an end. The Semitic section was also favored with the presence of a Hungarian crank, who had a word to say upon every subject, but the president was able to keep him in order. The most interesting item in the Semitic section was a statement of Dr. Ginsburg that he had discovered a fragment of the Jerusalem Targum on Isaiah. He presented the Congress with specimens of it, and excited great attention. It seems that this Targum on the Prophets was known in the Middle Ages, but it was lost sight of, and then its existence was doubted. The discovery of this Targum makes its existence a certainty. Dr. Ginsburg found it among some loose leaves that he himself discovered in an ancient tomb.

"The Rev. W. H. Heckler, Chaplain of the Church of England in Vienna, presented a chart giving a comparative chronological table of the biblical, Assyrian and Babylonian history, and exhibited some bricks that had been recently

brought from Babylonia. He wishes to make the recent discoveries useful to ordinary students of the Bible."—*Correspondent of the Independent*.

Under the title of the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, a monthly journal devoted to Assyriology and cognate studies has been started. It is issued under the direction of an editorial committee comprising Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie, Mr. W. C. Capper, and Mr. T. G. Pinches, of the British Museum; and the collaboration of the following scholars has been secured: Prof. A. H. Sayce, the Rev. H. G. Tomkins, M. G. Bertin, Profs. Fritz Hommel, C. de Harlez, Carl Bezold, Pleyte, M. E. Naville, and Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie. A special feature of the *Record* will be the publication, with facsimiles, of inedited texts from the British Museum. The first number appeared November 1, and contained "Akka-dian and Sumerian in Comparative Philology," by Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie; "The Plague Legends of Chaldea," with two plates; "Singasid's Gift to the Temple Ê-ana," by Mr. T. G. Pinches. 250 subscribers are required to ensure the continued issue of the *Record*; the support of all students of Assyriology and biblical archaeology is earnestly solicited.

Almost every day new light is being thrown upon the Bible by the investigations which are being conducted in the great fields of Assyrian and Egyptian research. One of the most noteworthy articles of modern times is that of M. Clermont Ganneau, of Paris, in the *Journal Asiatique* (July-August, 1886), on those mysterious words written upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace, *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*. A translation of this article will appear in January *Hebraica*.

The University of Pennsylvania has taken another step forward in the encouragement of Semitic work by appointing Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., to the chair of Arabic and Assyrian. With Dr. Peters and Dr. Jastrow thus associated, the cause of Semitic study may be expected to prosper in Philadelphia.

It is interesting to note the fact that in the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass., Prof. Brown has a class of three in Assyrian; and that Dr. Manly has a class of five in the same subject, in the Louisville Baptist Theological Seminary. With classes of like size at Harvard, Boston University, Union Seminary, Yale, and Johns Hopkins, America will soon be in a position to take her stand in this department side by side with England and Germany. The help afforded the Assyrian movement in this country by the publication of Prof. Lyons' *Manual* can hardly be estimated.

In New York City an Egyptologist died recently who has had a somewhat remarkable record. We refer to Dr. Gustav Seyffarth, who was over eighty years of age. He was a German by birth, and up to 1850 was extraordinary professor of Archaeology in the University of Leipzig. His specialty was the study of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and to the end of his days he disputed with Champollion the honor of having discovered the true key to the sacred writings of the monuments of Egypt. In 1850 he came to America and for three years occupied a chair in the theological seminary of the Lutheran church in St. Louis. From 1853 he lived in New York City, devoted to the pursuit of his favorite branch of study. He was a prolific writer in German, English and Latin, and on many points was regarded as an authority.

÷BOOK÷NOTICES.÷

BRIGGS' MESSIANIC PROPHECY.*

The author of this volume is well known to the theological public. On at least two questions he has taken what may fairly be called an advanced position, and in this position he has given and received many blows. His revision of "criticism" and his criticism of the "revision" have made him prominent in the department of Old Testament study.

A third line of work is now presented. What are its characteristics? What are its excellencies? What are its defects?

Prophecy is taken in its wide sense as "religious instruction," Messianic Prophecy is taken in its wide sense as "the prediction of the completion of redemption through the Messiah." He does not limit himself, therefore, to those prophecies which refer to a personal Messiah. Hebrew prophecy has much in common with the prophecy of other nations, but, at the same time, has certain distinctive features which raise it far above all other prophecy. The operation of the Holy Spirit upon the prophet is to be explained by the similar operation of the Spirit in "giving the Christian assurance of salvation." The contents of the influence differ, and there may be a difference in extent and degree of this influence; but the operation is practically the same.

Prediction is sharply distinguished from prophecy. All prediction is prophecy; but much prophecy is not prediction. Prediction is "an extraordinary feature" of prophecy. It is "the smallest section of the range of prophetic instruction." It is not peculiar to Hebrew Prophecy, but is found in the prophecy of all nations. The importance of prediction lies in the fact that Messianic prophecy is prediction.

That theory of prophecy which seeks above all to find the literal fulfillment of individual prophecies, a fulfillment of the word and of the details, is believed to be false. "Prophecies are predictions only as to the essential and the ideal elements. The purely formal elements belong to the point of view and coloring of the individual prophets. We are not to find exact and literal fulfillment in detail or in general; but the fulfillment is limited, as the prediction is limited, to the essential ideal contents of the prophecy.... Looking forth into the future, prophetic prediction clothes and represents that which is to come in the scenery and language familiar to it in the present and in the past." There is a clearly marked development in the growth of prophecy, from lower forms to higher; from general prediction to specific. "Messianic prophecy is an advancing organism expressing in ever richer and fuller representations the ideal of complete redemption through the Messiah. History advances with prophecy toward the same goal, but prediction points the way." Hebrew prediction has no double sense, and indeed, no successive fulfillment. What interpreters commonly understand to be "successive fulfillment," is but the realization of some phases of the messianic ideal before the ideal itself is attained.

* MESSIANIC PROPHECY, the prediction of the fulfillment of redemption through the Messiah; a critical study of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in the order of their development. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. 8vo, pp. xx, 579. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886. Price, \$2.50.

Partly in his language, and partly in our interpretation of his language, we have given the leading principles in accordance with which the subject is worked out. This presentation is necessarily brief and fragmentary.

Now, as to the application of these principles. In thirteen chapters there are discussed, 1) Primitive Messianic Ideas, 2) Messianic Prophecy in the Mosaic Age, 3) The Messianic Idea of the Davidic Period, 4) of the Earlier Prophets, 5) of Isaiah and his contemporaries, 6) of Jeremiah and his contemporaries, 7) of Ezekiel, 8) of the Exile, 9) The Prophecy of the Servant of Jehovah, 10) The Prophecy of the Restoration of Zion, 11) of Daniel, 12) The Messianic Idea of the Times of the Restoration, 13) The Messianic Ideal. Under these several heads are grouped the various individual prophecies. In this classification and presentation the author avails himself of the opportunity to carry out his ideas in reference to "criticism" and "revision." If the Messianic Idea is a development, it is necessary that each prophecy find its proper place in the series of prophecies. It is interesting to note the position assigned to Isa. XL.-LXVI., Zech. IX.-XIV., and other contested pieces. The author does not present the translation of the R.V., but his own. And in this he has presented, more fully than ever before, his ideas concerning Hebrew poetry, which have not been generally accepted, and indeed cannot be until they are given in systematic form. Here, too, he has shown a peculiar fondness for reconstructing the text. The emendations proposed on nearly every page, are worthy of careful study; we feel, however, that the reading of the Septuagint has too often been accepted instead of that of the Hebrew, without sufficient reason.

To sum up, the characteristic features of this book are (1) the historical theory of prophecy upon which it is constructed; (2) the emphasis laid upon the subordinate importance of prediction, as related to prophecy in general; (3) the application of the idea of development to the individual Messianic prophecies; (4) the application of the principles of higher criticism in locating the several prophecies; (5) the application of the principles of lower criticism in reconstructing the text; (6) the carrying out of the author's peculiar ideas as to Hebrew Poetry; (7) the boldness and vigor with which the whole work has been performed.

In conclusion, the spirit of the writer, while at times severe, is generally excellent. One cannot but feel that he is searching for the truth. The style, as an English critic has put it, is, although ungraceful, very clear. There are passages in which it is truly eloquent. We believe the author to be, in the main, correct in regard to the principles of prophecy which he lays down. And that the adoption of these principles will bring us back to the Old Testament; for the fact is, Christian students have strayed away from the book. There are many interpretations, many details, some of them quite important, in which he seems to have gone far away from a correct view. Perhaps nothing is more unsatisfactory than his interpretation of the Immanuel prophecy. One cannot regard as satisfactory the treatment of Isaiah LIII. That he has been unduly influenced by those views in reference to which he had previously declared himself so positively, is apparent. It remains, however, to be said, that this work is the first critical treatment of the subject that has ever been written in English; it is the only presentation of the subject from the correct stand-point, worthy of notice; it is a volume for which Bible-students,—*those, at least, of them, who desire to know the truth*, will be profoundly grateful to the author.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Daniel, an Exposition.* By Very Rev. R. P. Smith. London. 8vo.....6s.
- Abraham, his Life and Times.* By Rev. W. J. Deane. London.....2s. 6d.
- Graduated Lessons on the Pentateuch.* By W. Taylor. London. 8vo.....3s.
- Mélanges de critique biblique: le Texte primitif du premier récit de la création: le Deutéronome; le nom et le caractère du Dieu d'Israël Jahveh.* Paris: Lib. Hachette et Cie. 1886. Pp. iii, 406. 8vo.
- Die Qohlet-Literatur.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese des Alten Testaments. Mannheim, 1886.
- Judenthum und Christenthum.* By A. Hilgenfeld. Leipzig: Fues.....M.2.40
- "How readest thou?" Luke x. 26, or, the first two chapters of Genesis considered in regard to the direct text. By E. Dingle. London: S. W. Partridge & Co. 1886. Pp. iv, 79.
- Revision et reconstitution de la chronologie biblique et profane des premiers âges du monde d'après les découvertes de la science moderne et la savant système de M. l'abbé Chevalier: époque antédiluviennne, étude historique etc.* By V. Dumax. Paris: Lib. Haton. 1886. Pp. 234.
- Ancient Cities.* By Rev. Wm. Burnet Wright. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.....\$1.25
- The Messianic Prophecy.* By Charles Augustus Briggs. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 8vo.....\$2.50
- Abraham: the Typical Life of Faith.* By Rev. David R. Breed, D. D. Chicago: F. H. Revell. 2mo, pp. 160.....\$1.00
- Revision of the Old Testament.* Opinions of eminent German Hebraists on the revision of the Massoretic Text. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 62.
- Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden in rechtlicher und gesellschaftlicher Beziehung. Nach talmudischen Quellen.* Breslau: Preuss & Jünger. Pp. 66.....M.1.20

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel.* Herausgeg. von Lic. Dr. C. H. Cornill. (T. K. Cheyne) in Academy, Oct. 9, '86.
- L'étude de la religion égyptienne.* Son état actuel et ses conditions. By E. Lefebvre, in Revue de l'hist. des religions, juillet-août, '86.
- La religion chaldéo-assyrienne.* By E. de Presencé, in Revue de l'hist. des religions, juillet-août, '86.
- Die Anfänge der jüdischen Schriftgelehrsamkeit.* Eine akademische Vorlesung. By V. Rysssel. Theologische Studien u. Kritiken, 1887, 1.
- Hittites and Amorites.* By T. K. Cheyne. (A. Neubauer) in Academy, Oct. 30, '86.
- Messianic Prophecy.* By Prof. C. A. Briggs. (T. K. Cheyne) ib.
- Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament.* Dritte Lieferung. Die Genesis v. Dr. August Dillmann. Fünfte Aufl. Leipzig: Hitzel, 1886. (Francis Brown) in Pres. Rev., Oct., '86.
- The Jews in Rome, from Ancient Times to the Present.* Their Exodus from the Ghetto. By Madame Sofia Bomplani in N. Y. Observer, Oct. 28, '86.
- The Book of Zechariah.* 7. National Revival. By Rev. Marcus Dods in Expositor, Nov., '86.
- The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald.* 2. His Weakness and his Strength, as a Critic and as a Man. By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, ib.
- St. Paul from a Jewish point of View.* By Dr. S. M. Schiller-szinessy, ib.
- The Amorites and the Teraphim.* By A. H. Sayce in Academy, Nov. 6, '86.
- Outlines of Jewish History,* from B. C. 586 to C. E. 1885. By Lady Magnus. (P. A. Barnett), ib.
- Moses und sein Volk.* By Dr. H. Weiss. (Himpel) in Theol. Quartal-schrift, III., '86.
- Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur.* By Gustav Karpeles. Lief. 5. Saturday Review, Oct. 16, '86.
- Twenty-one Years Work in the Holy Land.* Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1b.
- On the Asaph-Psalms.* By Prof. C. H. Toy in Journ. of the Soc. of Bib. Lit. and Exegesis, June, '86.
- The Worship of the Tabernacle,* compared with that of the Second Temple. By Rev. S. J. Andrews, ib.
- Rainfall in Palestine.* By Rev. E. W. Rice, ib.
- On Zechariah vi. 1-7.* By Prof. E. C. Bissell, ib.
- The Divine Names in Job.* By Prof. H. M. Harman, ib.
- Jacob's Blessing.* By Prof. J. P. Peters, ib.
- The Ten Words.* By Prof. J. P. Peters, ib.
- Archæological Notes.* By Prof. J. P. Taylor in Andover Review, Nov., '86.
- The Resurrection of Buried Languages.* By Francis Brown in New Princeton Review, Nov., '86.
- Cabbalah of the Old Testament.* By J. R. Skinner in Path, Aug., '86.
- Arts of the Hittites.* Revue des deux Mondes, July 15, '86.
- L'archéologie et préhistorique et l'antiquité de l'homme.* By Hamard in La Controverse et le Contemporain, VII. août, '86.
- Quelques éclaircissements sur la chronologie biblique.* By J. Brueker, ib., VIII. sept., '86.
- Die assyrische Chronologie.* Excursus zu Abschn. II. des Aufsatzes "Zur Assyriologie." By B. Trew in Mittheilgn. u. Nachr. f. d. evang. Kirche in Russland. June, '86.
- The Prophecy of Jacob.* By Prof. M. S. Terry in Methodist Review, Nov., '86.
- Hebrew at Oxford and Cambridge.* Jewish World, Oct. 29, '86.
- Ueber die Hypothese Steinthal's, dass Simson ein Sonnenhüter war.* By Flöckner in Theol. Quartal-sch., '86, III.
- The Rose of Sharon.* By Prof. J. G. Lansing, D. D., in Christian at Work, Nov. 4, '86.
- Biblical Research.* By Rev. B. Pick, Ph. D., in Independent, Nov. 4, '86.
- Recent American Literature on the Old Testament.* Prof. S. Ives Curtiss in Expositor, Nov., '86.
- Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* By Wilhelm Vatke. Nach Vorlesungen hrsg. v. Dr. H. G. S. Preiss, in Athenæum, Oct. 9, '86.
- Babylonian Antiquities in the British Museum.* Episcopal Recorder, Oct. 28, '86.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

JANUARY, 1887.

No. 5.

IN the March and April (1886) numbers of THE STUDENT, special attention was called in various ways to what was believed to be a serious defect in the curriculum of the theological seminary. It was claimed that more work *in* the Bible should be done; and perhaps less work *about* it. It was argued that provision for the study of the English Bible in the seminary should be made. The subject was taken up by the religious press, and in some instances by the trustees of theological institutions. The results are already apparent. In not a few institutions has such study been introduced. It is worthy of notice that this position is supported by eight hundred and eighty-eight out of a thousand ministers in the active work of the pastorate, against forty-eight who do not look upon it with favor.*

CLOSELY connected with the subject of Bible-study^a in the seminary is that of Bible-study in the pastorate. It is a matter of some interest to know whether or not the minister, the divinely authorized interpreter and teacher of the Word of God, is really performing his functions in this direction. Whatever else he may have to do, and in these days the majority of ministers are compelled to do much work which they have no business to do, the pastor must *teach the Bible*. To teach it he must *know* it. To know it he must *study* it.

First arises the question, does the average pastor give to the study of the Bible a sufficient amount of time? Does the Bible occupy that share of his attention which it deserves? It may be taken for granted that the minister *studies*.† What does he study? On what is his time spent? And further, Shall one be satisfied with

* See page 133 of this number of THE STUDENT.

† Many of them, however, do not study.

that work done on the Bible which may be classified under the heads of devotional reading and sermon-preparation? These are necessary; but they are not Bible-study, although often wrongly regarded as such.

ANOTHER question suggests itself. Are the ministers of our day making an effort to keep up with the times in the line of Bible-study? With many of them the daily paper is a necessity; because they must be up with the times. But how many are as anxious to know the results of modern scholarship as applied to the Bible? It is true, they may entertain the feeling that the work of modern scholars is unreliable, and so shun any contact with it. That class of ministers is not a small one which holds the belief that so far as concerns Bible-truth, whatever may be said of other truth, the older the statement, the more correct it is apt to be. Would one believe that out of every one thousand ministers there are four hundred and twenty-six, nearly one-half, who use only the Old Version in their personal study of the Bible? If the only difference between these versions was the printing, as poetry of those portions of the Old Testament which are poetical, it is extremely difficult to understand why every real student of the Bible should not use the New Version in his personal study.

This is but one indication, and there are many, that the minister of the present age is slow to avail himself of what, if accepted, would prove most helpful. There is a widely prevailing timidity, called conservatism. It is not true conservatism. It is a timorous inertia.

MANY other questions relating to this same subject come up. Our readers are invited to study the article in this number entitled "Bible-study in the Pastorate; Figures and Facts." It will be found to contain much that is, to say the least, suggestive. In another number of THE STUDENT the matter will be considered in some of its more important applications.

BIBLE-STUDY IN THE PASTORATE; FIGURES AND FACTS.

By THE EDITOR.

In order to ascertain, as exactly as possible, the general amount and character of Bible-study carried on by men who are engaged in the active work of the ministry, as well as to learn the opinions of these men on certain questions relating to theological instruction, the writer prepared and mailed to twelve hundred ministers a printed form containing certain questions, with a request for answers to them. That the reader may be better able to understand and appreciate the results of the inquiry thus instituted, it is necessary to make a statement of certain points relating to this printed form, the persons to whom it was sent, and the replies received.

1. It was understood that the contents of the replies should be regarded as confidential, so far as concerned the publication of any statement in connection with any name. Had this fact been stated more definitely in the letter accompanying the printed form, the apprehensions of a smaller number would have been aroused.

2. This printed form was not intended in any sense to extort "confessions," although it would seem to have been regarded by some in this light, if the letters which accompanied their replies are to be accepted as presenting their views. The existence of this idea may, perhaps, also account for the fact that a number of those of whom the request was made, failed to reply; a failure profoundly regretted by the writer, because there were special reasons, at least in some cases, for supposing that the contents of the reply would have been of particular interest.

3. The ministers to whom the printed form was sent were of five denominations: Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian. *All were graduates of a theological seminary.* All were men engaged in the actual work of the pastorate. All had been in the ministry five years; none longer than twenty years. Every name was carefully selected.

4. The work of tabulating the "returns" has been one of extreme difficulty. Most of the questions were not of a character to be answered by "Yes," or "No." The cases of no two men were alike. The necessary brevity of the reply in many instances left much to be inferred. Care has been taken, however, to present the substance of the replies in what is believed to be a strictly accurate form.

5. As each one hundred replies was tabulated, it was noticed that the general average remained about the same. The statements herein given would not have been materially changed had the calculation been for five thousand instead of one thousand.

6. In order to give uniformity to the statement, the calculation in each case has been made upon the basis of *one thousand*. This will present clearly the relative proportion under each head.

7. Many details of a most interesting character were received in connection with the replies, which could not well be included in this presentation. These will furnish material for a second paper upon the subject in a future number of THE STUDENT.

8. The thanks of the writer are hereby tendered the gentlemen who so kindly and courteously granted his request for information.

1. Average time in the ministry of those furnishing information..	10¾ years.
2. Number specially interested in Dogmatic Theology.....	242
3. Number specially interested in Church History.....	252
4. Number specially interested in New Testament Exegesis.....	287
5. Number specially interested in Dogmatic Theology and New Testament Exegesis.....	45
6. Number specially interested in Old Testament Exegesis.....	55
7. Number specially interested in Old Testament and New Testament Exegesis.....	124
8. Number using in their personal Bible-study the Revised Version	366
9. Number using in their personal Bible-study the Old Version.....	426
10. Number using in their personal Bible-study both versions.....	208
11. Number giving a certain allotted time, outside of devotional reading and sermon-preparation, to both Old Testament and New Testament study.....	412
12. Number giving such time to New Testament, but not to Old Testament	76
13. Number giving such time to Old Testament, but not to New Testament	76
14. Number giving no special time to Bible-study.....	288
15. Number giving time to the study of topics involving biblical study.....	148
16. Number who have read the entire Old Testament in English one or more times since leaving the Seminary.....	636
17. Number who have read the entire Old Testament in Hebrew.....	*—
18. Number who have read in Hebrew certain books:	
Psalms.....	164
Pentateuch.....	102
Minor Prophets.....	52
Genesis.....	104
Isaiah.....	104
Job.....	16
19. Number who read Hebrew with some degree of regularity.....	*180
20. Number who have read the entire New Testament in English one or more times since leaving the Seminary.....	790
21. Number who have read the New Testament in Greek.....	204
22. New Testament books which have been read in Greek:	
Gospels by.....	212
Lesser Epistles by.....	112
Epistle to the Romans by.....	132
Epistles to the Corinthians by.....	84
Acts by.....	100
Epistle to the Galatians by.....	84
Epistle to the Hebrews by.....	92
Revelation by.....	48
23. Number who have taken up and made special study of separate books.....	740
24. Old Testament books which have been studied specially:	
Genesis by.....	262
Minor Prophets by.....	102
Psalms by.....	256
The Pentateuch by.....	96
Isaiah by.....	204
Ruth by.....	72
Job by.....	124
Jonah by.....	52
Daniel by.....	104
Song of Solomon by.....	36
25. New Testament books which have been studied specially:	
Gospels by.....	380
Epistle to the Galatians by.....	176
Epistle to the Romans by.....	368
Lesser Epistles by.....	160
Acts by.....	228
Philemon by.....	136
Epistle to the Hebrews by.....	228
Epistles to the Corinthians by.....	120
Epistle to the Ephesians by.....	212
Gospel of John by.....	116
Revelation by.....	192
Epistle of James by.....	48
26. Number who have done special work in Old Testament History.....	372
27. Number who have done special work in Old Testament Theology.....	228
28. Number who have done expository preaching.....	4624
29. Number who have prepared exegetical papers:	
a) On the Old Testament.....	132
b) On the New Testament.....	140
c) On subjects of which the department was not specified.....	124
30. In reference to the teaching of the English Bible in the Theological Seminary,	
a) Number out of a thousand favoring it	888

* Ten or twelve men had read more than one-half of the Old Testament in Hebrew, but no one had entirely finished it.

† It was difficult to make from the papers a satisfactory calculation on this point. The number 180 is probably an over-estimate.

‡ This was difficult to determine; men's ideas as to what expository preaching is, differ considerably.

b) Number out of a thousand opposing it.....	48
c) Number expressing no opinion.....	64
31. In reference to making Hebrew an elective in the Theological Seminary,	
a) Number favoring it.....	136
b) Number opposing it.....	808
c) Number expressing no opinion.....	66
32. In reference to the advisability of having in the Theological Seminary instruction in Biblical Theology as distinct from Systematic Theology:	
a) Number favoring it.....	932
b) Number opposing it.....	20
c) Number expressing no opinion.....	48

In submitting the results of this inquiry, our space will allow only a few general remarks:—

1. New Testament Exegesis, it will be seen, is the favorite study of the largest number of ministers. Including those whose special studies are divided between the New Testament and Dogmatic Theology, and between the New Testament and Old Testament, we find that four hundred and sixty-seven, or nearly one half of the whole number, take special interest in the New Testament. The other half, four hundred and ninety-four, give their chief attention to History and Dogmatic Theology. Fifty-five take special interest in the Old Testament, or, including those who combine the New Testament with the Old, one hundred and seventy-nine out of a thousand.

2. From one stand-point, the number of those making use of the Revised Version in their personal Bible-study, is surprisingly large. And yet, when one reflects that forty-three ministers out of every hundred, do not avail themselves of this new and best Bible-help, there must arise a feeling of sincere regret that men should be so blind to what is manifestly their own best interest.

3. At a rough estimate, only about one half give special time to the study of the Bible outside of devotional reading and sermon-preparation. Devotional reading of the Bible is not Bible-study; nor is the preparing of a sermon to be regarded as Bible-study, unless, indeed, the sermon is in the strictest sense an expository one. Topical study of a certain kind may well be classified under this head; yet we doubt whether much of it is, after all, real Bible-study. We must draw the line somewhere between biblical study and Bible-study. Both are important; but much that is classified under the former caption cannot be included under the latter. Right here, we believe, is the mistake of many men. They suppose themselves to be doing work called Bible-study. If, however, they would but reflect, they would see that the work which they do under this head is, after all, something else. It is, of course, good work, and necessary work, but *not* Bible-study.

4. There would, at first, seem to be ground for surprise that of those interrogated, not one had read the Old Testament through in the Hebrew. But let us think: Does any one of us have among his acquaintances in the ministry one whom he knows to have done this? The fact is, that there has been no encouragement for work of this kind. What every average student ought to do during his seminary course, and what each pastor ought to do every five years of his pastorate, has not been done even by one in ten thousand, not to speak of one in a thousand. It is, on the other hand, an encouraging feature of the returns, that so large a proportion, almost one in five, are now reading Hebrew with some degree of regularity. Four years ago, this would have been one in twenty-five. Five years hence, it will be *one of two*.

5. One minister in three has studied specially the Book of Genesis; one in four, the Psalms; one in five, Isaiah; one in eight, Job; one in ten, Daniel; one in ten, the Minor Prophets; one in ten, the Pentateuch as a whole; one in fourteen, Ruth; one in twenty, Jonah. We may, each for himself, decide whether or not this is a creditable showing.

6. We are surprised at the number, one in three, of those who have done special work in the line of Old Testament History; and even more so at the number, nearly one in four, who have given special study to Old Testament Theology.

The fact that the International Sunday-school Lessons have emphasized the need of historical work, will perhaps account for the first; while the latter number is no doubt due, in great measure, to the publication of Oehler's Old Testament Theology, under the editorship of Professor Day.

7. It was interesting to note the different opinions expressed concerning the value of expository preaching. Some had tried it, but, at the request of their auditors, had stopped. Others had found it more and more instructive and interesting. Is it really true that a man who *can* preach, will fail to interest his hearers in the interpretation of the Word of God, if he has prepared himself properly for his work? Such a thing is scarcely possible. It may be accepted as an established fact, that the man who fails as an expository preacher fails, not because the people do not wish to hear the Bible expounded, but rather, because the preacher has not learned how to expound it, or has not taken sufficient time for preparation. It is only a diligent student that can expound Scripture. Sermons, the most attractive, may be "evolved out of one's inner consciousness;" Scripture-exposition cannot be so evolved. In short, men fail in their attempt to expound Scripture because, strange as it may seem, they do not know Scripture.

8. Sooner or later, the Bible in *English* will be studied in all our seminaries. The times demand it. The demand must be granted. When nine ministers out of ten state in definite terms, upon the basis of their experience in the work for which the seminary is supposed to train a man, that it is desirable to have men trained in the English Bible, a pressure is brought to bear upon the seminaries which they cannot, if they would, withstand. Within five years every divinity school of influence will have made provision for instruction in the English Scriptures, not simply for those who study no Hebrew or Greek; but also for those who are at the same time doing linguistic work, and exegetical work of a critical character.

9. Hebrew will never generally be made an elective. That is, for full graduation from a theological seminary there will be demanded in the future, as in the past, some knowledge of this language. The present system of requiring of all men the same amount of work, will certainly be modified. It must be so arranged that men who have special inability in acquiring language, may use the bulk of their time in lines of study where, perhaps, the results accomplished will be greater. There is no man, however, worthy of graduation from a theological seminary, who cannot, if he will make a proper effort, acquire sufficient Hebrew to be of great practical benefit to him. It is sheer nonsense for a man to claim either that he cannot learn it, or that when learned he can make no practical use of it. This might have been said a decade since, but to-day such a statement cannot stand for a minute.

10. Finally; if all who favored the introduction into the theological seminary of "Biblical Theology" as a branch of instruction distinct from "Dogmatic Theol-

ogy," understood what is now meant by the term "Biblical Theology," there would seem to be very little difference of opinion in reference to the question. It is, however, a notorious fact that not one man in three really has a true conception of this term and of what it is intended to include. As in the case of the term "Higher Criticism," men will misunderstand it, no matter how often the correct meaning of it is presented. Nevertheless, one has only to know what "Biblical Theology" is to appreciate its paramount value. Of the various theological departments, this, more justly than any other, comes under the head of Bible-study.

The writer of this paper is a layman; he has never been a pastor. It may be said that such a one is in no position to appreciate the cares and burdens of a pastorate; that he little realizes the pressure resting upon the pastor, a pressure which renders study in many cases next to impossible; and that, consequently, it is not for *him* to sit in judgment on those whose position he cannot appreciate.

There is a measure of truth in this. It would, indeed, be wholly true, if from an outside position, with no knowledge of facts, and with no interest in the subject, he were coldly and formally to philosophize as to what ought to be done. But this is not the case.

During the past few years he has been brought, in a peculiar manner, into close relations with thousands of ministers. He has become personally acquainted with many hundreds. Every day in the year brings letters by the score from *ministers*, detailing their troubles, their difficulties, their disappointments, their afflictions. He has in this way gained a knowledge of the minister's life which even an experience of that life would not have given him. He is not on the outside, but rather on the inmost side. He does not write in order to criticize, but, if possible, to stimulate. And what is written rests upon the statements, the "confessions," as they themselves have termed them, of men in the work.

Let everything be granted that is asked; let every allowance be made that is demanded; let every fact receive its most favorable interpretation. It nevertheless remains true that the ministry, taken through and through, comes far short of doing in the line of Bible-study, what *is* expected of them, what *ought* to be expected of them, and what they *ought* to expect of themselves. The Bible is not known as it ought to be known, and is not used by them as it ought to be used. A reform is needed in this direction. Let it be inaugurated.

SOME FEATURES OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY ILLUSTRATED BY THE BOOK OF AMOS.¹

BY REV. EDWARD L. CURTIS, PH. D.,

Professor in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Book of Amos commences—after the motto giving its theme, divine judgment²—with the announcement of the guilt and impending punishment of the heathen neighbors of Israel. Damascus and Ammon have been inhuman in their warfare against Gilead.³ The Phœnicians and Philistines have driven a barbarous slave-trade and violated an ancient alliance.⁴ Edom, with unrelenting hatred, follows his brother Judah.⁵ Moab has outraged the most sacred feelings of ancient piety, burning into lime the bones of the king of Edom.⁶ Such are the transgressions of these nations. We notice that they are immoralities; and while they may have been all associated with wrongs done to the people of Jehovah, that is not made prominent here. It is rather the character of their deeds that brings them under divine condemnation. Amos thus opens his prophecy to pave the way for placing Israel under a similar judgment. If the nations who stood in no special relationship to Jehovah were thus to be punished, much more his own chosen people.⁷ Jehovah's regard for a people depended not only on his choice, but also on their moral quality.⁸ Hence Amos proceeds to depict most vividly the immorality of the northern kingdom, in order to bring it under condemnation. The oppression of the poor is mentioned again and again; the selling the righteous for silver, the needy for a pair of shoes;⁹ the turning aside the way of the meek;¹⁰ the longing for the new moon and the Sabbath to be gone, that unto the poor might be sold the refuse of wheat.¹¹ There is abominable dishonesty in trade, making the ephah small and the shekel great, dealing falsely with balances of deceit.¹² Justice is perverted.¹³ There is luxurious revelry, with fearful licentiousness and drunkenness, robbery and violence.¹⁴ Amos thus is conspicuous as an ethical preacher, and no minister of God since his day has rebuked with greater severity the crimes of the rich in the oppression of the poor. This, indeed, is characteristic of the work and writing of the prophets. They were ethical preachers. The guilt often most abhorrent to them was the wrong of man to man. Nathan plead the cause of Uriah the Hittite¹⁵ Elijah found the great crime and sin of Ahab in the murder of Naboth. This is given as the ground of the fall of the royal house;¹⁶ not the worship of Baal or the golden calves, but this murder most foul. Hosea's prophecy opens with an announcement of Israel's impending doom because the bloody deeds of Jehu should be avenged;¹⁷ deeds which elsewhere, because acceptable in destroying the house of Ahab, had been commended.¹⁸ Micah also was an ethical preacher, and appears as the special champion of the poor peasantry against lordly grandees.¹⁹ Isaiah spoke in a sim-

¹ A somewhat similar study from the Book of Joel by the writer appeared in THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. III., Nos. 4 and 5. The endeavor in this article has been to avoid repeating the features of prophecy there illustrated. ² i. 2. ³ i. 3. ⁴ i. 6 and 9. ⁵ i. 11. ⁶ ii. 1. ⁷ iii. 1 seq. ⁸ ix. 7. ⁹ ii. 6. ¹⁰ ii. 7. ¹¹ viii. 5 seq. ¹² v. 12. ¹³ ii. 7 seq., iii. 10, iv. 1, vi. 4 seq. ¹⁴ 2 Sam. xi. 1 seq. ¹⁵ 1 Kgs. xxi. 17 seq. ¹⁶ Hos. i. 4. ¹⁷ 2 Kgs. x. 30. ¹⁸ Mic. ii. 1 seq., iii. 3 seq.

ilar strain and was bitter against great land owners, saying: "Woe unto them that join house to house and lay field to field."¹ He classified great wealth with idolatry.² The condition, too, of his beautiful promise of forgiveness, is that of moral reform.³ Jeremiah took up the cause of bondmen and bondwomen.⁴ This, then, without further illustration, is the spirit of Old Testament prophecy. Its words are marked by far more of the spirit of preaching than of foretelling; they were uttered also often not that the future foretold in them might come to pass, but the opposite, that it might not. Amos said, Prepare to meet thy God.⁵ Seek good and not evil, that ye may live.⁶ Hate the evil and love the good: it may be that the Lord God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph.⁷ He had possibly a hope then, certainly a desire, that the impending ruin which he threatened might be averted. His message was no unconditional word of fate: not something which must be fulfilled in detail, but rather which should serve to set forth the principles of God's government in the world. Indeed Amos teaches that threatened destruction might be averted; for in answer to his prayer Jehovah repented, and said of specific judgments, that they should not be.⁸ That this also is the nature of prophecy is taught by the word of Elijah to Ahab,⁹ by the story of Jonah, by the repentance of the people at the preaching of Micah.¹⁰ This is, more over, expressly declared in the word given to Jeremiah: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it, if that nation concerning which I have spoken turn from their evil I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them."¹¹

But while prophecy thus may be said to be "never absolute, but always subject to moral conditions,"¹² on the other hand sometimes these very moral conditions are revealed. Thus to Isaiah was given the foreknowledge of Israel's continued obduracy.¹³ The purpose also of God in the choice of his people Israel cannot be thwarted and changed by man's conduct. His compassionate love is higher than his penal justice. His faithfulness can never be broken by man's faithlessness. Hence Amos closes his prophecy with a promise of the future redemption,¹⁴ which is never absent from the prophetic messages concerning Israel. But this redemption is not to come through the restoration of the northern kingdom, the almost exclusive subject of our book, but through that of the house of David. This is significant that in all Hebrew prophecy no hopes of the future ever cluster around Ephraim or any northern dynasty, although the glory and power of Israel were often superior to that of Judah. This fact shows a divine mind controlling the words of the prophets. They are not utterances suggested merely by the circumstances of their times or by the keenest human insight into the future. They are of God.

This divine element, however, does not rule out the human. All that which the wisest foresight, unaided by divine revelation, could give, must be allowed its part in prophecy. Amos was a discernor of his times. The instrument whereby Jehovah was to execute his wrath against Israel and the neighboring people, was not some unknown power beyond the prophet's historical and political horizon, but, as is indicated, one near at hand,¹⁵ beyond Hamath,¹⁶ and hence can only have been Assyria. This kingdom, about 800 B. C. according to the inscriptions,

¹ Isa. v. 22. ² Isa. ii. 7. ³ Isa. i. 16 seq. ⁴ Jer. xxxiv. 8. See also vii. 9. ⁵ iv. 12. ⁶ v. 14. ⁷ v. 15. ⁸ vii. 3, 6. ⁹ 1 Kgs. xxi. 29. ¹⁰ Jer. xxvi. 17 seq. ¹¹ Jer. xviii. 7 and also seq. Comp. Ezek. xviii. 25 seq. ¹² Edersheim's Prophecy and History, p. 152. ¹³ Isa. vi. 9 seq. ¹⁴ ix. 11 seq. ¹⁵ iii. 11. ¹⁶ vi. 14.

received tribute from the northern kingdom; and Jeroboam II., in whose reign Amos prophesied, may only as a vassal of Assyria have been permitted to extend his power so widely as to embrace Damascus.¹ Amos, now, may have been quite a traveler. It is certain that he was no uninformed man. He shows a clear geographical and historical knowledge of all Palestine. It is not impossible that he may have even visited Assyria. He easily at any rate could have learned of its colossal strength and power. Seeing then the weakness through moral corruption, the false security of the northern kingdom, he must have discerned that, unless Israel returned to moral purity and obtained strength in seeking Jehovah, the nation soon would be crushed and overthrown, together with her neighbors, by the advancing empire of the East. Already Assyria's movements were as the roar of a lion about to take its prey. And Amos most likely saw in it the divine instrument of punishment which should not be turned away.² Thus also was it with the other prophets. Though not without divine foresight, a supernatural gift, they are still to be regarded as keen observers and interpreters of their times. They saw what Jehovah was about to accomplish in the movements of the nations, and they sought to shape the conduct of their own people accordingly. They were statesmen, royal counselors, as is especially illustrated in the activity of Isaiah and Jeremiah, who endeavored to direct the foreign policy of Judah.

The Book of Amos illustrates also the relation of the early prophets to the ceremonial law, and the outward forms of religion; for Amos appears as no expounder or mere interpreter of this law and these forms. The people in his day were very religious. They kept the Sabbath, the unscrupulous not dealing on that day.³ They were punctilious about their offerings and sacrifices, their zeal apparently carrying them beyond the requirements of the law.⁴ Yet for all this Amos has not one word of commendation. It may be said that he regarded the worship of the northern kingdom as sinful because not at the central sanctuary at Jerusalem. But this he never intimates, and how could he, when even Samuel and Elijah had sacrificed elsewhere? It is true that the people are bidden not to seek Bethel or Gilgal or Beersheba;⁵ but the alternative is not that of seeking Jerusalem, but to seek Jehovah and live. The kind of seeking also is very plainly indicated. It is not that of sacrificial worship, but of heart and life service; for the word is: "Seek good and not evil, that ye may live, and so the Lord God of hosts will be with you."⁶ And again: "I hate and despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though you offer me burnt offerings and meal offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."⁷ Amos strikes here the burden of the prophetic teaching of the whole Old Testament. It is a constant protest against the separation of religion from morality: "To obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken than the fat of rams."⁸ "I desire mercy and not sacrifice."⁹ "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or ten thousands of rivers of oil? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and

¹ Schrader's Cuneiform Inscriptions, Vol. I., p. 208. ² i. 3, 6, 9, 11; ii. 1, 4-6. ³ viii. 5. ⁴ iv. 5.
⁵ v. 5. ⁶ v. 14. ⁷ v. 22 seq. ⁸ i Sam. xv. 22. ⁹ Hos. vi. 6.

to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"¹ "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs, or of he-goats....Cease to do evil: learn to do well: seek judgment: relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."² These are examples of the words of the prophets. They do not necessarily imply the non-existence or the non-recognition of the divine authority of the Levitical law, but may be taken as a warning against its being too exaltedly regarded, and an utterance of the spirit of him who said: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment and mercy and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone."³

PITHOM.*

NAVILLE AND HIS REVIEWERS.

BY REV. C. R. GILLETT,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Mons. Edouard Naville, in the employ of the Egypt Exploration Fund, went to the Delta of the Nile in the early part of 1883 to begin operations at Tanis-San-Zoan, but owing to the advanced state of the season, he turned his attention to the "Mound of the Statue" (Tell-el-Maskhutah) in the Wadi Timulat, on the old canal from the Nile to the Red Sea. The place had been identified by Lepsius with Raamses, on the basis of a number of monuments found there and subsequently removed to Ismaïlla, the main one of which represented Ramses II. seated between the solar deities, Ra and Tum. An examination of the texts prepared Mons. Naville for a result at variance with the theory of Lepsius, and he says that he formed the opinion that when the mound should be opened and its contents brought to light, the city would be found to be dedicated to Tum, and not to Ramses. The results of the excavation, not theories, must justify this hypothesis.

What was found is well known. An immense wall surrounded the nucleus of the city. Inside this, occupying the SW. corner, was a ruined temple, dedicated to "Tum, the great god of Theku." Behind it a part of the *naos* was found, which belonged to one of the monuments already in Ismaïlia. Eleven hieroglyphic inscriptions of greater or less size, and two stones containing a Græco-Latin and a Latin inscription were discovered, and are reproduced in the memoir.

The earliest of the Egyptian remains was from the time of Ramses II., and the latest from Ptolemy II. (Philadelphos), thus covering the ground at intervals between 1500 and 250 B. C. There is a probability that other Pharaohs besides those to be mentioned were active here, though no remains are found to prove it. This has been accounted for by the fact that the stone used for inscriptions was nearly all very soft and unable to stand exposure for a long time. Besides, when

¹ Mic. vi. 6 seq. ² Isa. l. 11 seq. ³ Matt. xxiii. 23.

* THE STORE CITY OF PITHOM AND THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS. By Edouard Naville. London, 1885. First Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund.

The Athenæum, London, No. 2094, Mar. 14, 1885; *Andover Review*, vol. IV. (July), 1885.

the Roman soldiery occupied this site, they leveled off the ground for their camp. The debris was cast into the subterranean chambers of which we have heard so much, and many monuments must have been destroyed, or so hidden as not yet to have come to the light. As all of these chambers have not yet been excavated, a rich harvest may still await the spade. Of kings of the twentieth and twenty-first dynasties it is *possible* that we have some monuments at Tell-el-Maskhutah, though by no means certain. Remains have, however, been uncovered bearing the royal oval of Sheshonk II. (Shishak), Osorkon II. and Takelot of the twenty-second dynasty, of Nectanebo I., a great warrior and an important king of the thirtieth dynasty, and finally of Ptolemy II. (284-247 B. C.).

Besides these two other stones were found of great importance. One of them reads thus LOEPO | POLIS | ERO | CASTRA : =(Λοεπο | polis | ero | castra). The meaning of *Lo* is unknown, but the rest is plain.* Of this stone Dillmann says:† "By far the most important result, so far as geography is concerned, from the finds of Mons. Naville, is in the establishing of the site of Heroöpolis." (p. 5.) This Heroöpolis is shown by the same inscription to have been also the Ero Castra of the Romans.

The other Latin inscription is longer and all the work of one hand. It reads: DDNN VICTORIBVS | MAXIMIANO ET SEVERO | IMPERATORIBVS ET | MAXIMINO ET CONSTANTINO | NOBILISSIMIS | CAESARIBI... | AB ERO IN CLVSMA | MI VIII o | .‡ Of this "find" the reviewer for the *Andover Review* remarks (*And. Rev.* vol. 4, p. 90), "M. Naville attaches great importance to a Roman mile-stone he found, which puts the distance between Heroöpolis and Clysma at nine miles. This only gives in round numbers what Bischoff and Möller (*Wörterbuch d. Geogr.*) state more exactly at eight miles and three quarters."§

* It is to be remarked that this stone is inscribed by two hands, the letter P in the second line marking the transition. Comparison with the facsimile will also show that the first line was engraved in a character more like the Greek lapidary script, while the last three lines are evidently Latin. The P of the first line is the Greek *ρ*.

† Ueber Pithom, Hero, Clysma nach Naville. (Separatabdruck.) Sitzungsbericht der K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin. Sitzung der philosophisch-historischen Classe vom 30. Juli 1885, xxxix.

‡ If there is a mistake in the last line, it is a double blunder, as there is a double designation of 9 miles as the distance between Ero and Clysma, θ being the Greek 9.

§ Cf. also *Andover Review*, iv, p. 87, where it is said, "In Bischoff and Möller's 'Wörterbuch der Geographie' (printed 1829) it is stated that 'Heroöpolis was a city in the east part of lower Egypt, on the southern bank of the river of Ptolemy, east from Pharbastis (i. e., Belbeis), 8½ miles northwest from the inlet to the Arabian Gulf.'" Later in the same article this "inlet to the Arabian Gulf" becomes Clysma to the writer's imagination. This quotation is an unfortunate one. In the first place, examination shows that *Clysma* is not even hinted at, much less mentioned in the original, and therefore it has been supplied by the reviewer in an unwarranted way. He makes his authority say what it does *not* say. In the second place, the whole interpretation of the statement of Strabo, etc., cited by Bischoff and Möller, as to the exact location of Heroöpolis, turns on the question whether indeed the sea never extended farther to the north than now. In the third place, the reviewer has omitted a very important part of the statement, which says that the site of Heroöpolis was at the present (1829) "*Abukcheid*" which the maps of the "Description de l'Égypte" place at or very near the present "Tell-el-Maskhutah." In the fourth place the writer does not seem to be aware of the contradiction which exists between the view of the dictionary and the geological argument (?) which he brings forward. If one is adopted, the other must fall, and *vice versa*. If Hero was at Tell-el-Maskhutah, then Clysma was nine (8½) miles away, very near the present Ismailia, and at the head of the "inlet" or "recess" of the sea according to Strabo. If, however, the sea never came further north than Suez, and if Clysma was near Suez, and was the only place that ever bore that name on the isthmus, then

This writer would thus discredit the mile-stone. How could this *more exact* distance be known? Whence did it come to be thus "more exactly" determined? No ancient authority has been quoted or in any way cited that supports the figures as understood by the reviewer, and yet they are thus taken on faith and thrown out to the disparagement of the work of Naville. The Itinerary of Antoninus does not give this interpretation any aid or countenance. It gives the following distances:* (a) "Heliu (usque) Scenas veteranorum millia plus minus 18 (22), (usque) Vico Judæorum mpm. 12, (usque) Thou mpm. 12, (usque) Hero mpm. 24, (usque) Serapiu mpm. 18, usque Clysmo mpm. 50." This citation does not accord with the *more exact* distance by about fifty-nine and one quarter miles, or making allowance for the short Roman mile (1614 yards) and assuming that the reviewer has failed to allow for the difference between the English and German mile,† the divergence might be reduced to something like twelve miles and one half, on the basis of the *long* German mile (5.753 Engl. miles). This explanation, however, is far from satisfactory.

But the mile-stone is really important, as is shown by the fact that Prof. Dillmann devotes considerable attention to it in the paper already mentioned. Of it as bearing upon the *location* of Hero he says (p. 4) that it cannot be adduced in evidence, as it may have been removed from its original place and transported to the spot where found. The *location* he had already accepted as *fixed* by the other stone. The value of this one is due to the fact that it gives a distance to another place. Now there are two courses open in regard to this stone, either to regard it as having sufficient evidential value to overthrow the correctness of the Itinerary (Naville) or as requiring the hypothesis of two places called by the same name somewhere on the Isthmus of Suez (Dillmann, pp. 7, 8). After an extended discussion of the various appearances of Clysmā in early literature, Professor Dillmann arrives at the conclusion "that there was a Clysmā near Suez. A Clysmā nine miles from Hero must have been a second. Before this can be considered assured it must be proved that (1) the mile-stone originally stood in Hero and was not carried there later, and (2) that the inscription on it really affirms what Naville finds there, that Clysmā was nine miles distant from Hero" (pp. 9, 10). On the basis of the existence of a Clysmā‡ a little to the north of Suez we are thus shut up to a choice between two, either the stone tells the truth, or it is false; it has been rightly interpreted, or it has been misunderstood. This is the *sole* question to be decided. The first point mentioned by Dillmann is of no importance whatever; for the story of the inscription is equally true or false whether it be found in Hero, Heliopolis, Tanis, Bulak, or the British Museum. The *one* question is as to the truth or falseness of the statement, and that belongs to others than the present writer to determine. It is a question in the department of Paleogeography.

Hero has not yet been found and the mile-stone is false. But all things point the other way. The whole strength of the review notice finally rests upon this one point, of which mention will be made later,—the ancient bounds of the sea.

* *Vetera Romanorum Itineraria, sive Antonini Augusti Itinerarium....curante Petro Weselsingio. Amstelodami 1735. Pp. 169-70; and, Itinerarium Antonini Augusti et Hierosolymitanum....ediderunt G. Parthey et M. Pinder. Berolini, 1848. Pp. 75-6.*

† The quotation is from the German dictionary named.

‡ This hypothesis, it may be said, is not as absurd as it might seem at first sight; for we have as yet no hint as to the date either of the city that has been identified (Dillmann) near Suez, or of the possible city which Dillmann says would be needed to accord with the record of the mile-stone.

The site, then, of Hero-Heroöpolis, is at last proved to be where it was sometimes suspected to be, though no one seems to have been very positive about it. An important question arises in connection with this identification in regard to its proximity to the sea. The testimony of the old geographers is mentioned more or less fully by the Andover reviewer, beginning with Theophrastus, and continuing with that of Lucian and Strabo. Strabo is said to confirm the statement of Theophrastus in stating that Hero is "near the end of the Arabian Gulf," and "near Arsinoë are situated, in the recess of the Arabian Gulf, towards Egypt, Heroöpolis and Cleopatris."* "Lucian is quoted as saying that 'a young man embarked at Alexandria, ascending the Nile, and sailed as far as Clysma, a port at the extreme end of the canal, at the Red Sea.'" The reviewer continues, "From all this it is evident that Clysma was a port on the Red Sea, at the eastern end of the canal, and that Heroöpolis was a town . . . 8½ miles west from Clysma."† To this statement very serious objection may be made on the ground of inconsistency, if the writer wishes to be understood that the inscription "Ero Castra" is authentic and its evidence conclusive. If this be not admitted, the position of Dillmann may be adduced to offset such denial, but the writer would at least be consistent in saying that "if the Red Sea ever extended north of the point which it now reaches, it must have been in some prehistoric period" (p. 87).

The testimony of the early geographers turns entirely upon the question of the former extension of the sea. They speak of Heroöpolis as at the head of the "recess of the Arabian Gulf," which is called by Strabo after this city. Those who hold that the sea never came further north than Suez, must hold that Hero is not at Tell-el-Maskhutah (on account of the discrepancy in the distances) and that it must be sought somewhere between "eight and three quarters miles" and nine miles from the "inlet of the Arabian Gulf," not from Clysma. There is, however, good expert testimony against this belief, even if "the evidence that any sea ever washed the Serapeum is only 'conjectural.'" The following may be cited as holding to a considerable extension of the sea northward: Sir J. W. Dawson,‡ of McGill College, Montreal; Edward Hull,§ Prof. Geology, Royal College of Science, Dublin, and Director of Survey of Ireland, etc.; Sir John Coode,|| and Du Bois Aymé.¶ It is a well-known fact that to-day the Suez Canal is only kept open and navigable by the constant dredging that is carried on. If this artificial water-way is thus in danger of filling up and choking, why should not an arm of the sea, never of any very great depth at best, suffer a like danger? Prof. Lepsius is said to have declared against this extension of the sea on the ground of the remains of a canal "north of Suez for a distance of three leagues." What does this prove? It would seem to indicate that the canal was put there to serve a purpose, that of water communication. What would be more natural after the filling up of the sea and the stoppage of water traffic in this way, than for the government to undertake to accomplish in an artificial way that which was no longer possible naturally?

* The Andover reviewer does not give this quotation *in extenso*, but says, "In another place (p. 804, not 884 as stated) he says it was near Arsinoë and Cleopatris," XVII., I., 26.

† The distance "8½ miles" is derived from a quotation already given and not repeated here.

‡ Egypt and Syria (By-paths of Bible Knowledge, VI.), p. 58.

§ Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement, April, 1884, pp. 137-141.

|| Ditte, April, 1885, pp. 97-99.

¶ Description de l'Égypte (1809) III. 187-192; IV. 715-732.

But too much space has already been given to this discussion. We pass over some points in the review of Naville's book, which seem to us unwarranted, and take up a point which concerns the author of the memoir rather than its subject. The Andover reviewer forgets himself in making the following statement, which in other periodicals of some sorts might be passed over in silence: "Besides, the announcement of M. Naville's discoveries was made with undue haste (in the *London Times*, the *Academy*, etc.) before he had time to read the inscriptions with care, and he must have felt constrained to verify the assertions of his too sanguine friends" (p. 90). To insinuate or openly charge any such literary dishonesty upon the author and then to couple it with such an epithet as the "scholarly Naville" and the statement (cf. p. 91) that "nothing can be more apparent, nothing more cheerfully recognized than the careful, painstaking, scholarly faithfulness with which M. Naville has done his work," is, to say the least, absurd. If the author has distorted facts in order to "verify the assertions of his too sanguine friends," he is tricky rather than "scholarly," deceitful rather than "careful" and "painstaking" in a bad rather than in a good sense. The sentiment that we criticize is unworthy.

To those who have kept abreast of the current discussion of the question of the identification of Pithom, the name of the district in which it was situated, Theku(-t), is familiar. Of this the reviewer says (p. 90) "The Thuku repeatedly mentioned on the monuments, M. Naville assumes to be identical with the biblical Succoth." An anonymous writer in the *Athenæum* (No. 2994, March 14, '85, p. 350), who criticizes Naville's book in an unfriendly manner and in a very superficial and unsatisfactory way, speaks thus, "On the monument found there M. Naville read the name of the god Atum or Tmu (commonly Tum), and as Ramses II. is always called the "friend of Tmu" in the inscriptions upon them, he concluded that the city was dedicated to this god. On a fragment of a naos he (Naville) found the name of Ramses II. and of a district called *Thuku*; and from this he argued that the place where he was excavating was called Pa-Tmu (i. e., the house of Tmu) or Pithom, that it was the Pithom which the Israelites built, and that *Thuku* was the same as the Succoth of the Old Testament."

Such is the insufficient and misleading statement of this writer, and it includes over half of his resumé of the work of the "brilliant and accomplished Egyptian scholar M. Naville" as he is pleased to style him.

These statements are true, so far as this identification is concerned, but it has supporters who are well qualified to pass judgment in the matter. It was not made by Naville, but by Brugsch, and has ample support in Ebers,* an Egyptologist second to none. The name occurs many times (we have counted it no less than nineteen times) in the monuments, and from the form in which it occurs it is designated as a land on the border, inhabited by people of a foreign race, and also as a city. From this it has been inferred that the name was at first applied to a district and afterwards to the chief city of the same. That this was a name of the city whose ruins are here buried there can be no reasonable doubt. The name which Naville reads Pi-tum and identifies with Pithom is also found on the same monuments. Leaving for a moment the question of the truth of this identification, let us consider the objection made by the Andover reviewer (p. 89). "The contrast between Pithom and Thuku in this respect ('determinatives' used after

* *Academy*, No. 681, New Issue, May 23, 1885, pp. 371-373.

each) is remarkable and calls for an explanation. It may be asked, Have we not a right to infer that the temple gave a name to the place? We reply, The place already had one name. It is repeatedly called the city of Thuku in the monuments of the nineteenth and twenty-second dynasties...and how *could* it be called Pithom at the same time?" No admission fuller than this could be asked by the most enthusiastic advocate of the Tell-el-Maskhutah-Pithom site. This final question is quite refreshing. If the trouble had been taken to examine the double nomenclature of Egyptian kings and *cities*, it would *never* have been asked. Let me cite some of those mentioned by Dümichen in his "Einleitung" to the "Geschichte des alten Aegyptens," von Eduard Meyer in Oncken's "Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen," and there printed on his *maps* of the "nomoi" of Egypt. *Us*, "city of the divine sceptre *us*," = *nu*, "city" (par excellence) = *nu-amon*, "city of Ammon" (Heb. מִנְיָן-אֲמֹן) = Thebes = Diospolis; *nubi*, "gold city" = *pa-sebek*, "dwelling of Sebek," = Ombos = Kum Ombo; *pu nti hi a-b-t n-ta sen i*, "city on the East of the land of Esne" = *pa chnum*, "house of Chnum" = Contra Lato, near present el Hilleh; *āpu* = *pa chem*, "dwelling of Chem" (Pan) = Chemmis, Panopolis, Δεβμυν.* This system of double names, the one sacred and the other "profane" or civil, is something quite familiar to students of Egyptology, and causes no surprise whatever.

The *Athenæum* writer remarks (p. 350), "If the Hebrews wished to transcribe this name (Thuku) in their own letters, they would certainly have used ת for the first letter of the name, and not כ." This question has been fully answered by Ebers in the article already mentioned. He states that many similar cases of the substitution of these letters could be given, besides the one quoted by Mons. Naville, in which the Egyptian *Theb-neter* becomes the Greek Σεβέννυτος.

The main interest to us as biblical students, in the excavations of Mons. Naville at Tell-el-Maskhutah is the identification of Pi-Tum of the monuments with the Pithom of Exod. i. 11. The reviewer says on this point, "...there is no evidence that he has found a city called Pithom, much less the city which Exod. i. 11 says the Hebrews built for Pharaoh" (p. 89). The writer in the *Athenæum* remarks also (p. 350), "The Pithom of the Exodus is apparently as far to seek as ever."

Now it is held by those competent to judge that there *is* evidence that this place is the site of old Pithom and all the facts yet discovered go to show that it was the very city in question. In the first place as to the name. It is found in the tablet of Ptolemy written fully and "determined" with the city sign, and also not thus determined in other texts. But there is another consideration only hinted at by Naville, which strengthens the argument greatly. These same texts draw a distinction between the *city* of Tum and the *temple* of Tum. The one was *Pi-Tum*, Pithom, and the other was *hau(t)-Tum*, temple or sanctuary of Tum. This distinction points most conclusively to the existence of a town called after the main deity of the region, and shows by monumental evidence that the city is there. As to the other point, the identity of the place, we can at least say that the results of the excavations correspond in a marked way with the facts as recorded in Exodus. The bricks that have been found (and the city is almost entirely composed of these), are of *three* sorts, with *straw*, with *stubble*, and *without* either, and they are laid in *mortar*, an unusual thing.

* Egyptian double names in italics.

The further discussion of the names of the city and of that of the region cannot now be entered upon. The present paper has already outrun the most liberal estimate as to length, and still much remains to be said. Many of the details of M. Naville's discoveries are of rare interest, but they cannot now be considered. The work is a grand one and well does the Egypt Exploration Fund deserve not only thanks but substantial remembrance in a financial way.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

THE HISTORY OF BEGINNINGS.

The first eleven chapters of Genesis are a record of the beginnings of human history, leading up to the history of Israel, which properly begins with the call of Abraham, chapter XII. It is now certainly known that much the same accounts of the beginnings of things existed among other ancient peoples than the Israelites. Assyrian writings of the times of Sennacherib have been deciphered, which claim to be copies of Babylonian writings older than the times of Abraham, and which contain, with variations of form, some of the accounts contained in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, including the two biblical accounts of the creation, and that of the deluge. As between these and the biblical narratives, the identification is unmistakable; and this being established, the two groups of accounts are further identified with similar accounts found among other peoples. The biblical accounts differ from all the others by the air they have of being simple statements of fact, made by a sober-minded believer in one God; the others, many of them much fuller in details than ours, are all marked by abundance of grotesque and fanciful embellishment. It is sometimes represented that the Hebrew accounts were selected from the Babylonian by some Hebrew monotheist; this is just as credible as it is that the canonical gospels were selected from the apocryphal. In such cases, according to all human experience, the simplest statement of facts is the earliest, and the embellished forms of the story come later. A sober statement drawn from a myth, would ordinarily have the form of a statement of principles or generalizations, not that of a statement of facts. The Babylonian accounts may therefore be fairly claimed as witnesses to the extreme antiquity of the more original forms of the same accounts, as now found in Genesis.

The dominant school of anti-traditional criticism holds that the account of the flood in Genesis is made up of two older accounts worked together. We have already seen that it considers the first account of the creation as part of an Elohistic writing of the time of Ezra. It holds that the title "these are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created," Gen. II. 4, belongs to the account preceding the title, and not, as commonly in other instances, to that which follows the title. To the same writing it attributes "the book of the generations of Adam," chapter V., except the twenty-ninth verse; also "the generations of Noah," being Gen. VI. 9-22; IX. 1-17, with other shorter sections and phrases, in the account of the flood; also "the generations

of the sons of Noah," the opening verses of chapter x., and parts of the remainder of the chapter; also "the generations of Shem," Gen. xi. 10-26, and "the generations of Terah," Gen. xi. 27, 31, 32.

Kuenen holds that the second account of the creation, with the story of the garden of Eden, belongs to the earliest of the three works from which Genesis was compiled—a work written about the eighth century B. C. Originally, in this section, Jehovah was written as the divine name, but the editor who placed the section in its present connection wrote it Jehovah Elohim, in order to make it apparent that Jehovah is the same with the Elohim of the previous section. The original account was the same that we now have, up to the first verse of the fourth chapter. That verse was directly followed by the last clause of verse 2, "now Cain was a tiller of the ground," and then by verse 17, thus omitting altogether what is said concerning Abel. This original Jehovistic writing, he holds, knew nothing of Abel, nothing of Seth, nothing of the deluge, but gave a list of the descendants of Cain, as far as Lamech, then, perhaps, made Noah the son of the Cainite Lamech, and the father of Shem, Japhet and Canaan, and so proceeded to take up the times of Abraham and his descendants. Later, some reviser or revisers introduced the story of Abel, and added a story of the flood, and then, in order to fit the parts together, inserted the accounts of Seth and his descendants. Several centuries later, the post-exilic editor who combined this earlier writing with the writing produced in Ezra's time, omitted the earlier genealogy of Seth's descendants, except the verse that explains the name of Noah, Gen. v. 29, and wrote instead the genealogy he found in the later account. In writing the remaining genealogies, and the account of the flood, he worked the two accounts before him together, so that large sections here display the literary peculiarities of both the older and the newer accounts. The mixed sections,—that is, those which cannot be assigned, except fragmentarily, to any of the supposed original works,—comprise from one third to one half of the eleven chapters.

For determining literary characteristics, it is necessary to have a connected passage of some length. In such a passage we may note the modes of speech an author employs, and those which he avoids, the way in which he constructs his sentences, and the way in which his sentences succeed each other, the turn given to his understanding of affairs and to his expressions by the point of view he has adopted, and other such peculiarities. But in the nature of the case, these phenomena cannot exist in disconnected sentences or fragments of sentences. Red bricks may be so built into a structure as to produce some particular architectural effect; but that would not justify our inferring the existence of that style of architecture wherever we find a red brick. The proposition that certain sections in this history of beginnings are so sharply distinguished from the contiguous matter, by their literary peculiarities, as to make it evident that the author did his work, in part, by copying memoranda previously written by himself or others is a proposition that can be argued upon evidence; the proposition that these sections can be so classified as to show that they were taken by the author from two or more previously existing continuous works requires, in addition to the evidence, the introduction of many hypotheses of revisions, interpolations, emendations, editorial combinations, to explain the phenomena which seem to contradict the proposition; the describing and dating of these supposed earlier works depends largely on the process of dissecting the parts of our present books which

are not contained in the strongly marked sections, and tracing the fragments to the several earlier works as their sources; and this process is mostly a matter of conjecture, lying outside the region of evidence.

JAN. 9. SIN AND DEATH. Gen. III. 1-6 and 17-19.

It is easy to foresee that the published comments on this lesson will make much of the alleged accounts of the temptation found in the mythologies of early peoples, and in particular, of the role played by the serpent in these mythologies. It will be a safe rule to doubt all such statements, particularly if they are very striking and satisfactory, until you know from what source they are derived, and how trustworthy that source is.

The tree of the temptation was not what we too often carelessly call it, "the tree of knowledge," but "the tree of the knowing good and evil." The account does not say that Adam and Eve were tempted through their thirst for knowledge or through their curiosity. Up to this time, they had knowledge only of good. They knew of evil, perhaps, negatively, as the opposite of good; but it was to them simply a term of reasoning; they had no actual positive knowledge of it. The tempter made Eve understand that she was unsophisticated as compared with beings who had such positive knowledge, that if she and Adam should have experience of evil as well as of good, it would open their eyes, and would make them wise in the sense of giving them shrewdness. This was the more effective because he had previously lodged in her mind the feeling that the divine command was an abridgment of her liberty to do as she pleased.

The theological doctrine commonly drawn from this passage is that of the fall of the human race. But the importance of this doctrine should not prevent our noticing that we have in the passage a type of the way in which temptation ordinarily comes to the innocent and the inexperienced. Any boy or girl who gets to feeling that obedience to right is a restraint, that it is rather ridiculous to be innocent through being ignorant of evil, and that it is a pretty good thing to be made worldly wise by some experience of evil, is being beguiled by the tempter who beguiled Eve. Our young people would be safe if they could be protected from this inclination to get their eyes opened by the knowing of good *and evil*.

JAN. 16. CAIN AND ABEL. Gen. IV. 3-16.

The theory above mentioned, that the story of Abel is a later insertion into the original narrative, is made plausible by the ease and neatness with which it can be detached; but even so, it is still more simple and natural to hold that the narrative always contained it. Instances in which a particular narrative can be neatly detached from a longer narrative that contains it are not at all uncommon. The fact that such a narrative can be separated from its context without mangling either is, by itself, no proof that it was originally a separate piece of composition, though the fact may, in some instances, fit into other proofs in such a way as to strengthen them.

The expression *migqets yamim*, verse 3, naturally describes the close of some recognized period of time,—a week, or a month, or a year, for example. This account, therefore, represents that regularly appointed periods for worship by sacrifice were already in existence in the time of Cain and Abel.

According to all critics, probably, this is the earliest use in the Old Testament of the word *mincha* in a sacrificial sense. It is the word which, in the ceremonial

law, the King James Version translates "meat offering," that is, "food offering," and which the New Version translates "meal offering." The old translation would apply, a little lamely, in the present instance; the new would not apply at all. Apart from its use in connection with sacrifices, the word means tribute, that is, a present brought to some one in recognition of his right to especial respect—ordinarily in recognition of his right as sovereign. In the ceremonial law the *mincha* is ordinarily an offering of fine flour mingled with oil, accompanying the sacrifice of an animal. Was this a recognition of Jehovah as sovereign, whenever an offering was made, by presenting to him a portion of the produce of the ground? The explanation is at least natural and plausible; and this explanation fits the instance of Cain and Abel, and every other instance in which the word is used, whether in the ceremonial law or out of it. The translation "tribute offering" would fit this explanation of the use of the term.

The Revised Version translates the word *robhets*, verse 7, by the English word "coucheth." The translation is a happy one because, like the Hebrew, it absolutely excludes what just now seems to be the favorite interpretation of the sentence, namely, that sin was crouching at Cain's door, like a wild beast ready to spring upon its prey. A concordance will show that the Hebrew word cannot have this meaning; its use is to describe an animal couching for rest, or a stone embedded in its setting of cement.

The phrase "doest well," as here used, should most naturally apply, not to well-doing in general, but to well-doing in the matter in hand, that is, to the making of a correct sacrifice.

These considerations strongly favor the interpretation which gives to *chatta'lh* here the meaning "a sin offering." Cain's remedy in the matter was not to find fault with Abel, who was not to blame, and who had no thought of disputing his rights as first-born and as ruler, but to take the proper sin-offering that lay couching at his door, and offer an acceptable sacrifice. It is assumed, of course, that his refusal to do so simple a thing as offer the sacrifice that God required was the expression of a wrong state of heart.

JAN. 23. NOAH AND THE ARK. Gen. VI. 9-22.

This lesson, like the last, corresponds to one of the detached sections recognized by the anti-traditional critics. They say that this section is from the same document with the first chapter of Genesis; the previous verses of the chapter they assign to the earliest of the three documents from which Genesis is compiled, or to some revision of that; they hold that the next two chapters were produced by working together the two separate accounts of the flood found in the two sources. This is equivalent to saying that these chapters, as they now stand, combine the peculiarities of both the alleged sources; and this does not differ greatly from saying that they have the peculiarities of neither. The two chapters seem to be closely written continuous narrative, the alleged inconsistencies of statement they contain being purely matters of conjectural interpretation. We may well hesitate before we accept a theory that requires us to regard them as made up of twenty-five or more fragments, pieced together from two or three previous works belonging to different literary ages.

The biblical account of the deluge differs from the other ancient accounts in several important particulars. Among others, it attributes the flood to two causes,—the forty days' rain, and the breaking up of the fountains of the great

deep; the other accounts know of no cause but the rain. The account in Genesis, moreover, gives a series of dates, measurements and circumstantial statements that are lacking elsewhere.

JAN. 30. THE CALL OF ABRAM. Gen. XII. 1-9.

FEB. 6. LOT'S CHOICE. Gen. XIII. 1-13.

These chapters, the anti-traditional critics say, came from the Jehovistic work which they regard as the oldest of the sources of the Pentateuch. Since, however, there are found in Gen. XII. 4, 5; XIII. 6, 12, etc., some of the marks which they regard as characteristic of one or both the later works, they explain that the earlier narrative has been revised by some one who introduced into it some clauses from the later. The alternative would be, of course, to suppose that these particular forms of expression are not as peculiar as they hold them to be. If we accept this alternative, as our stock of peculiar expressions grows smaller, our evidence in favor of any particular theory of the compilation of Genesis grows less.

The call of Abram is represented in the Bible as a point of departure in human history. The historical movement here beginning has widened into the history of the Israelite, the Christian, and the Mohammedan religions, with all the effect these have had on the races, the nations, the civilizations of mankind. The historical questions that start here are therefore the largest that belong to human history. They are of the more importance because the great truths of religious doctrine and of spiritual life now most dominant among men are inseparably bound to this historical movement. Those who do Sunday-school work do it from the conviction that the doctrine of redemption for men, wrought out through this movement, and especially through the chief factor of it, the incarnation and life and death and mission of the Messiah, is the doctrine of all doctrines.

In view of this, there has been a surprising neglect of certain aspects of this doctrine, as taught in Genesis, which the text of Genesis makes more prominent than any thing else. In Gen. XII. 2, 3, a part of the language of Jehovah to Abram is:—

“And be thou a blessing, that I may bless those who bless thee, and may curse those who make light of thee, and all the families of the ground may be blessed in thee.”

If words mean any thing, this means that Jehovah's chief purpose in choosing Abraham and Israel was to make them his especial channel of blessing to all mankind. In other words, we have here a perfectly distinct and clear statement of a great fundamental doctrine in soteriology. This statement is repeated five times in the successive parts of Genesis, each time with care to secure attention to it; and the doctrine is also taught in other forms of statement. Nothing else in Genesis is so emphasized as this; especially, no other point of doctrine as to God and his relations to men is so emphasized. I know of no work on Old Testament theology, of any school, which makes this doctrine thus prominent. Indeed, it is very currently assumed that this idea of blessing for mankind, through the chosen people, is a New Testament idea, and that the finding of any thing more than a shadow of it in the Old Testament is an unwarrantable importation of New Testament ideas into the older scriptures. Yet here it is in Genesis—not a shadow, but as sharp a statement as it is possible to make—not made once, or obscurely, but made many times, and pushed to the front as the one

religious doctrine more important than any other. Of course we must not import Christian ideas into the earlier scriptures; but equally, in the comparatively few instances when the earlier scriptures take pains to formulate a doctrine, and teach it dogmatically, we are not at liberty either to deny it or to leave it in the background.

The New Testament uses the statements concerning Abraham very prominently for teaching the doctrine of justification by faith. We are so familiar with this that we have allowed it to lead us to neglect the equally evident fact that upon these same passages, more than upon any other part of the Old Testament, the New builds its doctrine concerning the Messiah. The apostles taught that the Messiah was the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham; that the religious movement they were introducing was the carrying forward of that by which the nations were to be blessed through the father of the faithful. Thoroughly to have this in mind is to have at hand the solution of many difficulties concerning the religion of the Bible, and the means of gaining a larger and worthier conception of many of its most precious truths.

HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

BY PROFESSOR R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

Theological School, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

II.

A few words concerning the nature of the prophetic office. A prophet, or *nabi*, was not one merely who foretold future events. Indeed, he may not have foretold at all, and yet have been a prophet. This was a mere accident of his office, though as a matter of fact it does abound in the recorded utterances of the Old Testament prophets. But a prophet was one who spoke for another as his authorized agent, or representative. The word, or message, may or may not have been a prediction. It was simply the revelation of a fact, whether of a permanent and general nature, or one pertaining to the past, present, or future. It is true that the mass of the people was always more impressed, for the time being at least, by the miracles or predictions of the prophets than by their spiritual ideas; and it is easy to be explained why, after the permanent withdrawal of the prophetic gift, still greater weight has been laid, by both Jews and Christians, upon the predictive element of the prophecies which have been preserved. But it remains true that prediction was only one of the means whereby prophecy would accomplish its end. Prediction was not the whole even of heathen manticism, with which some have so incorrectly allied Hebrew prophecy. The object of both was to inform man how to do what was right and pleasing to the Being whom it regarded as supreme. But even a slight comparison of the two with each other enables us to see how far manticism fell below prophecy. Prophecy is unique. It is characteristic only of the religion of Israel, nothing closely resembling it being found in Mohammedanism or the religion of any other Semitic peoples. Indeed, the religion of Israel, as is well known, was peculiarly hostile to all forms of sorcery and soothsaying, upon which the prophets failed not to pronounce over and over again severe denunciation. They were sins which could be classed only with the worst.

Prophecy admitted that a knowledge of the future was desirable; but one of its functions, perhaps the one which comprehended all others, was to enable the Israelitish nation to know *what kind of knowledge* of the future could alone be pleasing to God and a blessing to man, and not merely to gratify an idle or selfish curiosity concerning the future. Prediction held the same relative place in God's dealing with his Old Testament people that miracle held in the hand of Christ. In healing the blind or feeding the five thousand he had an object in view beyond the mere restoration of sight or the satisfaction of hunger. These, obviously, were only incidents—suitable means to a far higher end. Prophecy employed prediction only when it was needful to do so, fulfilling its function not merely, perhaps not mainly, by the miracle of foreknowledge, but also by pointing the eyes of the nation backward to the holy and righteous government of God as manifested in their own history, and to the aims of divine providence as exhibited in that history. The object thus sought was to qualify the people to anticipate and thereby avoid possible judgment, to walk conscious of and ever mindful of their own mission as the chosen people and of the great future which this involved, ever regarding it as beneath their dignity to yield to the natural yearning for soothsaying. They already knew *their* future; they did not, like the heathen, need to be informed, and the words of the prophets were to be regarded as rather of the nature of reminders. "Therefore thou hast forsaken thy people the house of Jacob, because they . . . are soothsayers like the Philistines" (Isa. II. 6). "And I will cut off witchcrafts out of thine hand; and thou shalt have no more soothsayers" (Mich. v. 12). Or in other words, the office of prophecy was to promote the interest and unfold the ways of the kingdom of God. It was constantly retrospective, but it was so in order that it might be prospective. It looked backward in order that it might draw such lessons from history as would enable it to look ahead.

There is a form of rationalism which holds that the prediction of particular events, which also in many instances fell within the sphere of prophecy, is inadmissible on the ground of its destroying human freedom and thereby interfering with history. History implies freedom, they say; but if the prophet predicts that Israel will, then Israel must; and there is no longer freedom and hence no longer history. But rather than reject the possibility of history, the rationalists of this school prefer to reject the possibility of the predictive element in prophecy. This view must be summarily rejected. We are not driven to such an alternative. The course of the world is not entirely, perhaps not even mainly, dependent on the arbitrary decisions of the human will. And yet man is free. But the freedom of history is the freedom of God. He rules.

Heathen manticism was a failure. It appealed largely to idle or selfish curiosity, and left the people as it found them. Hebrew prophecy was not a failure. But this difference was the outcome of a deeper difference. Instead of appealing to idle or selfish curiosity, Hebrew prophecy was not infrequently in direct and dangerous antagonism with it. The prophet lost his head; the mantis knew how to drive a good bargain, and did it. A mantis was merely, or pretended to be merely, the ecstatic utterer of an oracle, unconscious, irresponsible; and his utterances were made with unnatural distortions. *Maivethai* hints strongly of the foaming mouth and streaming hair. The facts are in harmony with the etymology. Not so with Hebrew prophecy, whatever the etymology of the word *nabi* may seem to imply to the contrary. We read of no cases of frenzy or even facial distortion.

If the words of the prophet bubbled up, or boiled at all, it was only in the sense that the words of honest, and earnest, and entirely responsible thinkers and speakers have often done the same thing. The Psalmist says,

"My heart was hot within me;
While I was musing the fire kindled;
Then spake I with my tongue" (xxxix. 3).

And Jeremiah: "If I say, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in mine heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing" (xx. 9). It was this that made the words "boil forth" in the case of the prophet. Heathen manticism was only a form of divination. Hebrew prophecy in its active form was interpretation, in its passive the reception of a revelation. There was no incantation about it, no art, no ceremony, no formula of any sort. But the magicians could do, or pretend to do, only by means of "their incantations;" they could speak only after consulting the horoscope, or inspecting the entrails of a victim. Philo and the Alexandrian school were wrong, identifying as they did, though perhaps unintentionally, Hebrew prophecy with manticism. "The human understanding," says Philo, "takes its departure on the arrival of the Divine Spirit, and, on the removal of the latter, again returns to its home." Josephus substantially repeated Philo's words (*Antiq.* book iv., ch. vi. 5). So did the Christian father Tertullian. "For when a man is rapt in the Spirit," says he, "especially when he beholds the glory of God, or when God speaks through him, he necessarily loses his sensation, because he is overshadowed with the power of God—a point concerning which there is a question between us [the montanists] and the carnally minded" [the other Christians]. (Against Marcion, book iv. chap. xxii.). He calls the prophetic state *amentia*. But the words quoted are surely a sword which might be made to cut most dangerously in the very direction in which neither Philo, nor Josephus, nor Tertullian, would wish. This view, however, of the prophetic state was not the one generally held by the fathers. They generally believed that the true prophets, who were filled with the Spirit of God, were still able to discharge their prophetic functions with "a quiet and tranquil mind." Origen (e. g.) says that if the soul "encounter no perturbation or alienation of mind whatever from the impending inspiration, nor lose the free control of its will"—it is proof that it is moved by the indwelling, or suggestion, of a good spirit (*Princ.*, book iii. chap. iii. 4). He instances the case of the prophets.

God did, however, at times employ the vision and the dream in communicating his word, or message, to man. But it was not the dream, and it was not the vision, of any form of manticism. The visions of Isaiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, find no correspondence in heathen theology. But these were not God's usual mode of communicating his message. The more ordinary mode was by direct revelation and manifestation, through a divine impulse given to the prophet's own thoughts. He was caused to think something which, ordinarily, he would not, and could not, have thought. This constituted his inspiration, or prophetic state.

Generally, he was still in his waking or ordinary physical condition. His mind was in a state of passivity only in the sense that it was in a receptive attitude, though this receptive attitude may at the same time have been one, and doubtless often was one, of intense alertness. It was this condition of mental alertness, indeed, which rendered the man capable of becoming an inspired prophet; or, in other words, became in him the basis on which the Holy Spirit could operate. Of

course, God could transform lifeless stones into prophets; and only in this sense was it possible for God to constitute any man at random an inspired prophet; for not every man had the natural endowments or acquirements which were necessary at the outset as a substructure for the supernatural. What Isaiah was when "moved by the Holy Ghost," depended very largely upon what Isaiah was when *not* moved by the Holy Ghost. Two men may have the same teacher and yet become very unequal scholars. Two men may see the same objects, or read the same history, and yet draw from them very different lessons. The holy men of old spake as they were moved, and they were moved in accordance with what they were before they were moved. But they did not reach the subject-matter of the heavenly message by any process of reasoning. It boiled up in the prophet's consciousness, and boiled forth in oral speech. But from the message communicated to him he might by processes of reasoning deduce others; or, the reflective faculty being awakened, he might endeavor to understand what he had uttered. But they did not in every case, at least, succeed. "And I heard, but I understood not," said Daniel; "then said I, O my lord, what shall be the issue of these things? And he said, Go thy way Daniel; for the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end" (ch. XII. 8). And Peter affirms of the prophets generally that they "sought and searched diligently," as miners search in the earth after precious metals, concerning what time and historical circumstances the Spirit of the pre-existing Messiah had reference to when he testified to them of the salvation which should come (1 Pet. i. 10). The question, therefore, What did the prophet understand by his message? is by no means identical with, What does the message mean? or, What did the Holy Spirit intend by it? And this last question it was not possible, in many cases, for either prophet or people to fully answer.

But notwithstanding this, all Hebrew prophecy is characterized by its remarkable practical character. While the people did not know all the end aimed at, they knew it well enough. Prophecy was not intended exclusively for the contemporaries of the prophets; and these contemporaries knew very well, or might have known, all that was intended for them. When the prophet said, "Turn ye, turn ye, O house of Israel," as he did say over and over again, in one way and another, the people knew very well what that meant. And when he said "Retribution," which also, in one phraseology or another, was one of the "burdens" of prophecy, the people understood very well what that meant. They may not have understood all that it meant for some future generation, but they understood enough of what it meant for them. So also when the prophet uttered a message of promise. It might have been couched in enigma, or symbol; but whether so or not, the people could always know that it meant *something* good, though they might not know any of the particulars. They could distinguish the rainbow from the cloud; the promise from the threatened retribution. It was not necessary for them to know the details. The people, like the prophets themselves, needed always to be kept on the alert; and the only way to keep them on the alert was for them to always have in mind the question, I wonder what sort of good thing this is that is promised? I wonder what sort of evil thing this is that is threatened? By hope and apprehension should they be saved, both as individuals and as a nation. And the same principle still obtains. It would be far from best for us to understand all prophecies.

W. M. L. DE WETTE.

By W. W. EVERTS, JR.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

"I know that there is salvation in no other than the name of Jesus Christ, the crucified, and that there is nothing higher for mankind than the divine humanity realized in him, and the kingdom of God planted by him." With this parting testimony to this world, De Wette went, June 16, 1849, to confirm it in the other. In his last book, published in 1846, he refers to "the Son sitting on the throne at the right hand of the Father, as co-regent and equipped with all divine power." In 1839 he joined with Lücke in a protest against the propagation of the views of Strauss in the University at Zürich. In 1837, he wrote in his commentary on John: "Important for the Christian faith is the fact of the resurrection of Jesus; though a shadow, that will not lift, rests on the way and manner of it, still the fact itself cannot be put in doubt; and that shadow itself is pleasant to faith, that loves a mystery. Our Christianity is too much a matter of desk-wisdom, not enough of faith and life. The people are under the influence of the clergy. Only be firm and strong in faith, you leaders, filled with the spirit of truth and love, alive in Christian sentiment, and preach the Christ who stands just as truly in history as he lives in all Christian hearts, and doubt will gain no power." In reply to the mythical theory of the origin of the Gospels, he says: "A law of experience, that is valid in all history, is this, that all great discoveries, creations and institutions in human life, even if they are based in the susceptibility, longing and need of the masses, still always belong to the activity of superior individuals. Certain general movements, like the Reformation, the French Revolution, may be referred to the masses, the age, the nation or the corporation, but the decisive moments in them can be ascribed only to certain individuals. By this law of experience, we assume that Jesus Christ was the founder of Christianity." In 1831, in his *Dogmatics* he speaks of the Pietists as "relatively the best kind of Christians," and condemns the dislike of creeds as "the fruit of ignorance, superficiality and conceited dogmatism." He went so far as to recommend to the Council of Basel the punishment of change of creed and mixed marriages, on the ground that true progress in our days consists in emphasizing the importance of the creed."

As far back as his Berlin days, which closed in 1819, he demanded the restoration of the creed as the standard for popular education, as against the terrible chaos produced when every man teaches the people what and as he will, to the great abuse of the most important doctrines of religion. Referring to those days, in a dedication to Lücke, he recalls "the spirit of confluent love to Christian truth" that prevailed in their little circle. When he entered Jena, a young man of nineteen, the Gospel story was to him, the son of a pastor, enshrined in a sacred halo.

The above references to De Wette will, no doubt, surprise those who are accustomed to think of him only as the negative critic, the pupil of Paulus and teacher of Strauss and Theodore Parker, who doubted the incarnation, treated the descent of the Holy Spirit as a self-deception on the part of the Apostles, scouted the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as the degradation of the

idea of immortality to a physical theorem, and relegated the doctrine of the trinity among things antiquated. How are such contradictory statements from the same lips to be explained? "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" A glance at his life may enable us to solve the riddle. While De Wette was favored in being a pupil of the poet Herder, and the text-critic Griesbach, it was his misfortune to hear lectures from Paulus, who endeavored to explain the miracles by natural causes. Then his faith fled, and "I was proud in the thought that I could become moral without any belief. This delusion, however, soon vanished. I found myself so desolate without faith in the supernatural, so forsaken, thrown, myself and the whole race, into the world without any purpose, that all within me was divided and uncertain, no living motive stirred my cold heart, and death stood as a hostile demon in the background of my life." Referring to the doubts, from which he never fully recovered, he says, in 1837, to Lücke: "My reasons for doubting the genuineness of the fourth Gospel will perhaps appear too skeptical to you, and pain your love for the 'only, tender, right chief Gospel.' I beg you to remember that, as I earn neither favor nor any other advantage from my skepticism, but prepare nothing but vexation for myself and awaken suspicion against myself, there is, at least, no self-interest in it, even if (which God knows better than I do) there is no pure motive of the love of truth leading me. I wish for nothing more longingly than a clear and sure understanding of this important Gospel. You know that it is not vulgar dread of the miraculous and superhuman that has thus far hindered me from arriving at that result. Negative criticism compels further investigation, and, if it is answered, a positive result is gained." In such expressions we feel the heart-beat of the great scholar. Like Schleiermacher, he tried to stand in the breach between rationalism and orthodoxy, and naturally received denunciation from both sides. The rationalists called him a "mystic," but Neander saw in him "an Israelite indeed." Much as we may lament his training, such it was, and out of the mire of unbelief he succeeded at last, by his lofty integrity, ardent love of truth and childlike spirit, in planting his feet on the solid rock of revealed truth. Great is the debt of gratitude due De Wette. He was a breaker of new paths. His translation of the Old Testament, made before he was thirty, put earlier versions in the background. His *Archæology* was the first systematic treatise on the subject. His *Introduction to the Old Testament*, after seventy years, is still called for. His edition of *Luther's Letters* is standard. His commentary on the Psalms, "short, clear, precise, thorough," made an epoch. He produced a revolution in commentaries. In 1817 he declared: "The shallow, dry, godless exegesis, called grammatico-historical, will serve no longer. It is neither grammatical, for it misuses language and does not understand its living laws; nor historical, for it does not investigate, does not live with and in history, and has no historical perception; nor is it exegesis, for it is not the interpreter of the holy; the holy it neither knows nor understands. The comparison of Jewish opinions and rabbinical sayings will not lead into the divine spirit of Christianity; for no one yet has understood life by death. If you do not enrich your own spirit, and lift your gaze to living contemplation, you will always remain in the vestibule of the sanctuary and never receive the anointing." What wonder is it that he who believed *sanctæ res sancta mente* was considered by Schleiermacher sufficient inspiration and ornament, and no picture but De Wette's was allowed on the walls of his study.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

In these days when the thoughts of many Bible-students are being directed towards the beginnings of things, much that is interesting, helpful and profitable will be found in Dr. George Dana Boardman's "Studies in the Creative Week," a series of lectures characterized by a wonderful clearness and breadth of thought.

The minister and the schoolmaster are not now, as formerly, the only students. There are many business men who in the highest and truest sense are students and scholars. These men study and sympathize with students. Few are aware of the influence exerted by Mr. Benjamin Douglass, of Chicago, in the recent revival of interest in Hebrew and Old Testament study. Himself a scholar he has appreciated the efforts of others in this work, and has rendered aid which such a man alone could render.

About ten years ago the German traveler Mauch found, on the south-eastern coast of Africa, nearly opposite Madagascar, a number of curious old structures which he claimed to be the relics of Phœnician trading posts. The English Consul at Mozambique, Henry E. O'Neill, has revisited these places, and in his recent report to the Geographical Society of London expresses his conviction of the correctness of this view. The ruins point to a people considerably advanced in culture and art, and inquiry developed the claim on the part of the natives that some of these ruins are covered with a kind of a cuneiform writing.

Among the younger Old Testament specialists of Germany none is more prominent than Professor Hermann L. Strack, extraordinary professor in the University of Berlin, and one of the associate editors of *Hebraica*. Under his editorship the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, or series of short grammars of the Oriental languages, is being remarkably successful. He himself prepared the Hebrew grammar of this series, and, although the German appeared only about a year ago, it has already been translated into English, Danish and French. Professor Strack is also an active worker in the cause of Jewish missions. He is at the head of the Berlin *Institutum Judaicum*, and publishes a little monthly, the *Nathanael*, in the interests of Jewish mission work. He has taken a prominent part in the work of city missions in Berlin, and his controversy with the great leader and agitator Stöcker, as to the proper spirit and method of this work has attracted the favorable attention of all Germany. He is closely allied in spirit and work to Delitzsch.

From Jerusalem some important excavations are reported. The Dominican monks bought a piece of property about three hundred metres from the Damascus gate. Six metres under the present surface the workmen found a subterranean vault of considerable size, and with carefully built walls. A short distance from this they found a chapel at whose entrance was a stone covered with inscriptions. Before these could be deciphered the stone had been stolen, and nothing has been heard of its whereabouts since. Some fine specimens of mosaic were also un-

earthed, and as the remains of some splendid columns were also found there, it was thought that this is the place where, in the fifth Christian century, the empress Eudoxia erected a magnificent basilica to the honor of St. Stephen. Later the workmen uncovered a large and beautiful room with walls of stone. Two of the walls contain each two doors which form the entrance to four large chambers for the dead. On both sides of each chamber was a place for depositing a body, and in the background room for one or two more. The central room opens into a second room which contained three large sarcophagi with lids. It is thought that this is the place where Helen, queen of Abiadenus, and her two sons are buried. A large number of bones of dead bodies were found in these rooms, but no further inscriptions of any kind were seen.

Professor Franz Delitzsch, of Leipzig, has for a number of years been conducting in the English language an Anglo-American Exegetical Society, for the special benefit of American and English students pursuing Old Testament studies in Leipzig. It is his custom to take one or more leading Old Testament publications and to examine them critically as to their merits or demerits. Last year the Society studied Kuenen's new work. The University lecture course for the winter semester just published announces that the book to be worked through during this term is Professor Green's "Moses and the Prophets" (1883). This is doubtless the first time that the book of an American author has ever been made so prominent in German circles, where a foreign literary production is generally considered to have merit only in so far as it reflects German thought either by imitation or by development. This selection made by the leading Hebrew scholar of Europe is a deserving compliment to the leading conservative scholar among the Old Testament men in America.

That specialists in this or that department of research should write fiction as a recreation is, of course, nothing new. But we doubt whether any others who have tried this double role have been equally successful with Professor George Ebers, the great Leipzig Egyptologist. He is favorably known as a Christian scholar of a superior type, and through such works as "*Durch Gosen zum Sinai*," and "*Aegypten und die fuenf Buecher Moses*," to have rendered valuable service for Christian apologetics. About fifteen years ago ill health compelled him to seek rest at a watering-place. He employed his leisure days by writing a romance of Egyptian life, based upon his studies of that country, intended not for publication, but only to be read to his wife and intimate friends. These were so delighted with the work that they urged its publication, and in this manner "*The Egyptian Princess*" first saw the light of day. It received a royal welcome, and was soon followed by "*Uarda*," "*Homo Sum*," and others which evinced the same poetical imagination with a solid back-ground of accurate scholarship. Ebers' career in both Egyptology and in the writing of historical romances has been remarkably successful. He is yet in his best years, and although his health has not for many years been good, there is reason to hope that his facile pen will yet produce much that is instructive and interesting.

There are schools in philology as well as in theology and other sciences, and between the representatives of the various schools the clash of arms is sometimes heard. In Semitic, or rather Hebrew lexicography, the so-called Leipzig school

has, for some decades back, held almost supreme sway. It bears this name because its leading representatives, the two veterans, Fleischer the Arabist, and Franz Delitzsch the Hebraist, are professors in Leipzig. The leading thesis of this school is that the Arabic represents best the oldest form of Semitic speech, and that in etymology and in definitions this tongue must be made the basis and source. Pupils often go farther than their masters, and the abuse, probably more than the use of this thesis, has occasioned a declaration of war against its dominion. The Assyriologists of Germany, toward whose researches the majority of German theologians and historians have not only been cool but even hostile, demand that the controlling voice in Hebrew lexicography be taken from the Arabic and given to the Assyrian. The younger Delitzsch in his *Hebrew Language* and in his *Prolegomena* has cited a large number of words which can find a better explanation from the stand-point of Assyrian than from the Arabic. The certainly correct theory is maintained that true lexicography must be primarily based upon the actual usage of the words in the language, and the coming Hebrew dictionary is the one in which this fundamental method goes hand in hand with a judicious use of the dialects.

The Germans are active in mission and charity work in Jerusalem. Since the death of Bishop Gobat, the two most prominent Germans in the Holy City are Architect Schick and the "Orphan's Father" Schneller. The former has been an official resident there for many years. He is a thoroughly educated man, and his topographical studies in Jerusalem and Palestine constitute some of the most valuable contributions to our knowledge of the Holy Land. He co-operates heartily with the German Palestine Society in its work. He has taken great interest in mission work also, devoting his main attention to the cause of Jewish missions. The persecution of the Jews in Russia, Rumania, and other countries of Eastern Europe, about three years ago drove thousands of poverty-stricken Jews to Palestine, where there are already poor Jews in superabundance. The enterprise of the Christian mission created for these refugees an agricultural colony at the village of Artuf, between Jerusalem and Jaffa, where an opportunity to earn a living and secure an education for their children was offered. The enterprise was in the hands of Rev. Friedländer, a missionary in the employ of the British Society for Jewish missions. The venture has proved almost a failure, and the colony is now reported to be almost deserted. The colonists apparently took their chances at a few pennies of the annual donations sent from all the world to the Jews of Jerusalem, rather than earn an honest living by tilling the soil. Schick was also much interested in this work. Schneller established, about twenty years ago, an orphan's home in Jerusalem, and has done much for the education, both intellectual and manual, of the Arab boys and girls of the neighborhood. The work done in the asylum far surpasses that of the native Turkish manufacturers.

Professor Euting, of Strassburg, has, amid many dangers and with extreme labor, traveled through the heart of Arabia, in order to search for old inscriptions. He reports some interesting items concerning the water in that great country. For eight long months he did not see a drop of flowing water, with the exception of one small shower, and only at the end of his route did he meet with a living well at El Ola, whose water, however, flows only 300 metres and then is lost in the sand. All other water disappears in the ground as soon as it falls from the

clouds. As pumps are unknown, ditches are dug, and in these, as also in bags, the water is kept. All those places where the experience of the past has taught that water can be kept all the year round have been taken by the few villages scattered about as their own property. Thus, for instance, Hajel, the capital of the Shammar country, a city of 13,000 inhabitants, possesses about seventy wells with an average depth of thirty metres. These are all "drawn" by camels, which draw the leather buckets out of the wells by means of ropes over wooden rollers. The water in nearly all of these wells is very warm, and before it can be used for drinking, it is cooled. The greatest and most famous well in Arabia is that of Teima, in the Hedjas. This well is mentioned already in Isa. xxi. 14: "The inhabitants of the land of Tema brought water to him that was thirsty." The Bedouins asked the professor if they had such wonderful fountains in Germany. When the answer was given that in this land there were more than 4000 rivers and streams of all sorts that never dried up, and that the whole land was like a garden, the chieftain of Tema said, "If all this is true that you say concerning your country, why then did you ever leave it? And then, where there are no camels, no dates, no Bedouins, and where there is no liberty to wander back and forth over the whole land, is that a country worth having?"

One of the difficulties which the biblical student, in common with the Orientalist in general, has is to find a suitable transliteration for the proper names of the Old Testament. As the Hebrew, like the other Semitic dialects, has sounds for which we have no exact equivalent in English, such as the *ain* and the shades between the other gutturals, the source of the trouble is at once seen. It is true that the usages of the Authorized Version has secured a certain authority for the transliteration now generally employed by English writers, but it is well known that the A.V. followed unreliable authorities in this matter, and is often glaringly inconsistent. Thus the proper name חֲנוֹךְ if found in four passages in the Old Testament, viz., Gen. iv. 17; v. 18; xxv. 4; Exod. vi. 14 (Gen. xli. 9), and in two of these places the name is transcribed "Hanoeh," in two others "Enoch," and so on *ad infinitum*. Attempts to secure a scientific basis for a correct transliteration of oriental and biblical words have been repeatedly made. Perhaps the most noteworthy and most acceptable attempt in this direction was that made by the recently deceased Berlin Egyptologist Richard Lepsius, who in 1856 published his "Standard Alphabet for Reducing Un-written Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters." A second edition followed in 1863. He invented signs and marks for sounds not found in our European alphabet, some of which are still used in transliterating Hebrew. But as a system the idea never found general acceptance. Some modern writers have adopted a sort of a phonetic method, writing, e. g., Béd-ween for the common Bedouin. Here, again, the signs of our modern languages do not admit of accuracy in the reproduction of the oriental sounds, even if the exact and generally accepted pronunciation were known to exist. For the present it will probably be best to adhere to the traditional transliteration, especially in biblical names, but always with the proviso that in this shape these names are worthless for scientific research.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Darstellung u. Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausens von Geschichte u. Religion des Alten Testaments.* Von R. Finsler. Zürich: Schultess. M.1.20
- Alte Denkmäler im Lichte neuerer Forschungen.* Ein Ueberblick über die durch die jüngsten Entdeckungen in Egypten, Assyrien, Babylonien, Palästina und Kleinasien erhaltenen Bestätigungen biblischer Thatsachen. Von A. H. Sayce. Leipzig: O. Schulze. 1886. 8vo, pp. viii, 232. M.2.50
- Beiträge zum Ausgleich zwischen alttestamentlicher Geschichtserzählung, Zeitrechnung u. Prophetie einerseits, assyrischen nebst babylonischen Keilschriften andererseits.* Dargeboten zu Nutz der Gemeinde des Herrn von N. Howard. Gotha: F. Perthes. 1887. 8vo, pp. xxix, 290. M.5.—
- Die Bucher Numeri, Deuteronomium u. Josua.* [Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum A. T., 13. Lieferung.] Von A. Dillmann. Leipzig: Hirzel. 8vo, pp. v, 680. M.11.—
- Revision et reconstitution de la chronologie biblique et profane des premiers âges du monde d'après les découvertes de la science moderne et le savant système de M. l'abbé Chevallier.* 3^e fasc. 2^e époque, dite postdiluvienne, etc. Par V. Dumax. Paris: Lib. Haton, 1886, pp. 219.
- Den heliga skrift och den negativa kritiken.* Ett apologetiskt b drag. By C. E. Johansen. Upsala: Akad. bokh. 1886. 8vo, pp. 242. kr.3.—
- The First Book of the Kings.* With Introduction and Notes. By J. R. Lumby. London: Cambridge Warehouse, 1886, pp. 268. . . . 3s. 6d.
- Daniel.* An Exposition of the historical portion of the writings of the Prophet Daniel. London: Nisbet, 1886, pp. 338. 6s.
- Memoir on the Geology and Geography of Arabia Petraea, Palestine and Adjoining Districts.* With special reference to the mode of formation of the Jordan-Arabah Depression and the Dead Sea. By E. Hull. London: R. Bentley & Son (Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund), 1886, pp. x, 145, with plates and woodcuts. 18s.
- Commentarius in libros Samuclis, seu I. et II. Regum.* Cursus Scripturae sacrae, auctoribus R. Connelly, J. Knabenbauer, F. de Hummelauer alisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris. By F. de Hummelauer. Paris: Lethielleux. 1886, 8vo, pp. 470.
- Die Constitution Israels zum Volke.* Von M. Mayer. Frankfurt a. M. [Würzburg: Goldstein.] 8vo, pp. 23. M.—.80
- Kommentar, kurzgefasst, zu den h. Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, sowie zu den Apokryphen.*—A. Altes Testament. 4. Abth.: Die Propheten Jesaja u. Jeremia, ausgelegt von C. v. Orelli. Hrsg. v. H. Strack u. O. Zöckler. N rdlingen: Beck. 1887. 8vo, pp. xi, 406. M.5.50
- Vier taal voorlezingen oer profeten desouden verbonds,* gehouden te Utrecht, etc. By J. J. P. Valetou, Jr. Utrecht: Kemink en zoon, 1886. 8vo, pp. viii, 259. fl.2.50
- La Bible, traduction nouvelle d'après les textes Hébreu et Grec.* 1. 1. Les Jnges.—I. et II. Samuël.—I. Rois. Par E. Ledrain. Paris: A. Lemerre. 1886, 8vo, pp. x, 327. fr.7.50
- Paradigmen zur hebraeischen Grammatik.* Von H. L. Strack. Karlsruhe: Reuther. . . . M.—.30
- Die Ehe im Alten Testament.* Inaug.-Dissertation [Jena]. Von Chm. Stubbe. Pp. 71.

- Prolegomena zur Geschichte Sauls.* Inaug.-Dissertation [Leipzig]. Von E. Herrmann, Löbau, 1886. 8vo, pp. iv, 50.
- The Book of Job as Poesy.* Inaug.-Dissertation [Leipzig]. By G. H. Gilbert. Rutland, 1886. 8vo, pp. 73.
- Geschichte und Bedeutung der Stadt Sichem.* Inaug.-Dissertation [Leipzig]. Von A. Eckstein, Berlin, 1886. 8vo, pp. 50.
- Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden nach biblischen und talmudischen Quellen.* Inaug.-Dissertation [Jena]. Von Richard Grünfeld.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- By-Paths of Bible Knowledge.* Vols. I.—VII. By J. F. McCurdy in Presbyterian Review (Can.), Nov. 18, '86.
- The Song of Songs.* By Prof. R. V. Foster in Pulpit Treasury, Dec., '86.
- Wellhausens Methode kritisch beleuchtet.* (O. Naumann.) By W. Nowack in Deutsche Lit.-Ztg., Oct. 23, '86.
- Joseph's Forgetting.* By Principal R. Rainy in Expositor, Dec., '86.
- The Revised Version of the Old Testament.* The Book of Job. By Prof. A. B. Davidson in Expositor, Dec., '86.
- The Book of Zechariah.* VIII. The Consummation. By Rev. Marcus Dods, ib.
- Note on Isaiah XLII.* 18. By Prof. Owen C. Whitehouse, ib.
- New Testimonies to Biblical Records.* By H. S. Osborn in Pulpit Treasury, Jan., '87.
- Chronology of the Old Testament.* Independent, Dec. 23, '86.
- Recent Old Testament Literature.* Ib.
- Die Ethik in der Halacha.* (M. Bloch, Budapest, '86.) By C. Siegfried in Theol. Lit., Dec. 11, '86.
- L'histoire religieuse d'Israel et la nouvelle exegese rationaliste.* (De Broglie.) Annales de philos. chrétienne, Nov., '86.
- Die Einteilung des Dekalogs in den ältesten Bibelhandschriften.* (E. Nestle.) Theol. Studien aus Württemberg, 1886, 4.
- Gath and its Worthies.* By H. S. Tomkins in Report of Palestine Exploration Fund. Oct., '86.
- Researches in Southern Palestine.* By G. Schumacher in Report of Palestine Exploration Fund, Oct., '86.
- Facts and Considerations bearing on the Origin and Condition of Primitive Man.* By Principal Sir J. William Dawson in Sunday School Times, Dec. 25, '86.
- The Critical Analysis of the Pentateuch.* By Prof. Wm. Henry Green, ib.
- The Text and its Teaching* (Gen. 3:1-6, 17-19). By Prof. S. R. Driver, ib.
- Suggestive Jottings.* By Prof. Franz Delitzsch, ib.
- Eregesis of Job XVI. 22, XVII. 1.* By Rev. Jos. A. Sayton in N. Y. Observer, Dec. 30, '86.
- "The Entering in of Hamath."* By Francisus, ib.
- The Septuagint as a Critical Aid.* Independent, Dec. 30, '86.
- Some Recent German Theological Works.* Ib.

⇒THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.⇐

VOL. VI.

FEBRUARY, 1887.

NO. 6.

IN the January STUDENT, certain "figures and facts" were indicated which related principally to the study of the Bible in the pastorate. The whole matter was summed up briefly as follows:

"Let everything be granted that is asked; let every allowance be made that is demanded; let every fact receive its most favorable interpretation. It nevertheless remains true that the ministry, taken through and through, comes far short of doing, in the line of Bible-study, what *is* expected of them, what *ought* to be expected of them, and what they *ought* to expect of themselves. The Bible is not known by them as it ought to be known, and is not used by them as it ought to be used. A reform is needed in this direction. Let it be inaugurated."

Is this statement too strong? Is it without basis? Is it a gratuitous criticism? What do the ministers think? Do they believe themselves to be doing, in this line, not what they might desire to do (no man does this), but even what they *ought* to do, or what they *might* do? The great majority of ministers who ask themselves this question will do what hundreds of those did of whom the question was asked; they will "confess"—(1) that they have by no means done what they might have done; (2) that, in truth, they have scarcely realized, until brought face to face with the question, how little they have been doing; (3) that, as a matter of fact, they have needed a stirring up on this question, and deserve censure for their neglect. There are some ministers, of course, who, in this particular, as indeed in all others, have performed their whole duty. The cases of such we need not consider.

WE need not go far to find explanations of these facts. It is notoriously true that theological seminaries have come far short of doing what ought to have been done for the students who have gone out from them.

Much, almost everything, depends upon the start which a man receives. If he is not taught to study the Bible in the divinity school;

if the principles and methods of such study are not furnished him there; if an inspiration for such work is not received by him there,—is it probable that he will do his whole duty when he is settled in the pastorate? It is the *beginning* work in any study that is most difficult. It is to aid men in *beginning* such study that seminaries have been endowed. Yet in the case of nine seminaries out of ten, and in the case of nine men out of ten, nothing, in this line, has been accomplished. It is true, however, that, in the midst of what has been darkness, light is slowly dawning. The day is coming when to graduate from a theological seminary one must know something of the Bible. When that day shall have come, more of the Bible will be preached from the pulpit, and less of—"the world."

AGAIN, not every minister has a true appreciation of the importance of such study. It is difficult for one to feel the lack of something which he has never possessed. The ministry is pervaded by that spirit which characterizes exegetical study as "hair-splitting," the study of the original languages of the Bible as "altogether too laborious," the study of prophecy, or similar topics, as fruitless. It is still necessary—how long it may continue so is doubtful—to take one's text from the Bible; but it is no longer fashionable to take the sermon from the text. The Bible, in short, is being gradually but surely crowded out. It is old; the demand is thought to be for something new. Ministers have, in too many cases, forgotten that the brightest, freshest and most interesting material to be found is in the Bible. They are blind to the fact that the people, everywhere, are wide-awake to Bible-thought and Bible-truth, if but properly presented. It is a serious mistake to lack appreciation for the value of Bible-material in their own up-building, as well as in that of those who are dependent on them for spiritual food. Yet multitudes of ministers make this mistake. If only the testimony of those who have gone deep into this kind of work were to be accepted, if the experiences of the Taylors, the Duryeas and the MacArthurs were to be studied, it would not appear that five ministers out of every ten had no time for real Bible-study.

No small part of the explanation of these facts is to be found in the tendency, which characterizes the ministry of to-day, to get along without study of any kind. Our ministry cannot be called a studious ministry. In many respects it excels the ministry of any preceding age; but in this one respect it shows decadence. Ministers have, in too many instances, either never acquired habits of study, or, if ac-

quired, they have lost them. Matters of the most trivial character are permitted to interrupt their work. They take upon themselves the entire responsibility, financial as well as spiritual, of their charges. They weigh themselves down with details with which they have no business to meddle. They do not systematize their work in order to allow intellectual work even a fair share of their time. Men thus burdened do not, cannot study. And in the general neglect, the Bible must suffer.

MINISTERS do not study the Bible as they ought to study it, and as it deserves to be studied. They themselves acknowledge this to be the case; and when attention is called to the fact, in most cases resolve to do more work of this kind.

Of those now in the pastorate few have ever received that fundamental training in real study of the Bible, that needed inspiration for it, which would lead them to continue it in the pastorate.

Too many fail to see the absolute importance of such work, and the necessary connection which it sustains to the success of their labors.

Too many, alas! have no true idea of study, have no habits of study, have no ability so to systematize their time and work as to allow for real intellectual exercise.

These are some, but not all, of the reasons *why* Bible-study in the pastorate is neglected.

BOOK-STUDY : GENESIS (PART II.)*

By THE EDITOR.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. If it were not for repeated testimony to the contrary, the writer would feel that these "Book-studies" have so large an element of sameness as to render their continuance undesirable. The general order of work must be largely the same. Minor modifications may, to be sure, be introduced; but after all, there cannot be a large amount of variation.

2. The favorable reception which the "Book-studies" have been granted is due simply and exclusively to the fact that many students have felt the need of that which the "Book-studies" aim to furnish, viz., *directions for study*. Those who are at heart students do not wish merely to be told that this or that is true. They prefer to investigate for themselves, to look on various sides of a question, to come to a deliberate and self-obtained conclusion. And the results of such work, however imperfect, are of infinitely more value than those of any other method.

3. The authorities recommended for the former "study" on Genesis are also to be consulted for this. But let care be taken *first* to study and master the Scripture account. Commentaries must occupy a secondary place.

4. He who would study literature and history must have the *historical spirit*. Without this, the work performed will be largely futile. What is the historical spirit? We shall not attempt to define it; but it includes, among other things, (1) an untiring industry in the searching out of details; (2) a desire to learn the relation of various events to each other; (3) a readiness to accept the truth when found, even if it seems opposed to opinions previously held.

II. DIRECTIONS.

1. *Read* Genesis XII.-L., noting, in the case of each chapter, its general thought, and connection with what precedes and follows.

2. *Prepare a list of chapter-topics* which will include the material of the entire section; study these topics until each at once suggests to the mind the details included under it, and until the *number* of the chapter suggests both the topic and the details.

3. *Analyze* this section: Select three or four, perhaps five, general subjects under which may be classified the various topics already prepared. *Make your own analysis*.

4. *Index* this section: Select the more important (*a*) persons, (*b*) events, (*c*) places, (*d*) objects; and connect with each, in the order narrated, the statements which relate to it.

5. *Arrange*, in the order of their occurrence, the principal events recorded in this section, and attach to each its proper date. Learn this list of dates.

* A "chapter-study" on Exodus xv. was promised for this number of THE STUDENT; but the necessity of treating Genesis in two "studies" requires the postponement of the "chapter-study" to a later number.

6. Study the following list of the more important topics suggested by the chapters under consideration. If there are other topics suggested which to your mind seem equally important, insert them in this list in their proper place. If any of those here suggested seem to be of only secondary importance, or if they are of no particular interest to you, omit them. The list is as follows :

- 1) Abram's blessing, Gen. XII. 1-3.
 - 2) Abram's first act of deception, XII. 10-20.
 - 3) Lot's choice, XIII. 8-18.
 - 4) Invasion of Chedorlaomer, XIV. 1-12.
 - 5) Melchizedek, XIV. 18-20.
 - 6) Abram's vision and God's covenant with him, XV. 9-21.
 - 7) The rite of circumcision, XVII. 9-14.
 - 8) Abraham's intercession for Sodom, XVIII. 23-33.
 - 9) Destruction of Sodom and the Cities of the Plain, XIX. 1-28.
 - 10) Abraham's second act of deception, XX. 1-18.
 - 11) The sacrifice of Isaac, XXII. 1-19.
 - 12) The purchase of the Cave of Machpelah, XXIII.
 - 13) The marriage of Isaac, XXIV.
 - 14) Birth of Jacob and Esau and the sale of the birthright, XXV. 19-34.
 - 15) The blessing of Jacob by Isaac, XXVII. 1-40.
 - 16) Jacob at Bethel, XXVIII. 11-22.
 - 17) Birth of Jacob's sons, XXIX. 31-XXX. 24.
 - 18) Jacob's dealings with Laban, XXX. 25-XXXI. 55.
 - 19) Jacob's wrestling with the angel, XXXII. 22-32.
 - 20) The story of Dinah, XXXIV. 1-30.
 - 21) The descendants of Esau, XXXVI.
 - 22) Joseph's dreams and the treatment received from his brothers, XXXVII.
 - 23) Judah's sons, XXXVIII.
 - 24) Joseph's promotion and subsequent imprisonment, XXXIX.
 - 25) Joseph an interpreter of dreams, XL.-XLI. 36.
 - 26) First journey of Joseph's brothers to Egypt, XLII.
 - 27) The second journey ; Joseph's disclosure of himself, XLIII., XLIV., XLV.
 - 28) Jacob's descent and settlement in Egypt, XLVI.-XLVII. 12.
 - 29) Jacob's blessing of Joseph and his two sons, XLVIII.
 - 30) Jacob's death and burial ; Joseph's death, L.
7. In the case of the topics cited above, and others which may have been inserted among them, proceed as follows :

- 1) Read carefully the biblical passage covering the topic.
- 2) Study also the passages immediately preceding and following it.
- 3) From memory, and by means of concordance and commentary, collect all other biblical passages which will throw light on the passage (or any part of it) under consideration.
- 4) Make out a series of questions which will call up
 - a) All the important geographical, archaeological and historical points of which a knowledge is needed in order to understand the passage ;
 - b) All the more important words and phrases in the passage ;
 - c) All the difficulties of any kind presented by the passage ;
 - d) The leading points suggested by parallel passages ;

- e) Material of any kind found in commentaries, histories, or books of Bible illustration which have been examined in the course of the study.
 - f) The essential features of the passage viewed as a whole.
8. Consider each topic in the order of the outline suggested by the questions thus prepared, and master the details thus called for.
9. Take up by itself the forty-ninth chapter and make of it a special study according to the outline given in the November STUDENT.
10. Study the "critical analysis" of Gen. XII.-L.:
- 1) Distinguishing in some way the various documents or writings which are claimed to exist ;
 - 2) Noting the peculiarities by which each of these writings is said to be characterized ; and
 - 3) Determining for yourself, whether or not there is ground for the claims made.

HEBREW PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

BY PROFESSOR R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

Theological School, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

III.

Concerning the peculiarities, or characteristics, of prophecy,—some of them have been alluded to in the preceding pages,—the following may be briefly mentioned :

1. Its intensely moral character. It is not merely "predicted history." It is not merely "tidings about the future." "It had a present meaning and a present lesson to those who heard it," and to those who should come after them. The prophet could not have been a prophet had he not also been a preacher, a preacher for his own times, a preacher for all generations. The saying of the apostle, "that all Scripture. . . . is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness," applies no less to prophecy than to other inspired Scripture. Its aim is to enlist every thing on the side of practical holiness. Its prediction, its retrospection, its warnings, its rebukes, its promises, all look largely to this end. It nowhere stops with mere knowledge.

2. Its evangelical character. It went beyond the sphere of ethics. It is pervaded with truth adapted to our nature as fallen and guilty. It looks beyond the sacerdotal to the spiritual ; beyond morals to religion. The prophetic books are not equally evangelical ; but the Messianic idea, in the broader or narrower sense, is found in them all. It is this that gives them coherency ; in this is found their "higher unity."

3. Its time-element. The future in prophecy often appears as immediately present,—predicted events or conditions being spoken of as now transpiring, or as already past. Balaam, who for the time being was a prophet of Jehovah, furnishes an illustration (Num. xxiv. 15-19) : what he saw, his natural eye being closed, he saw as at that moment taking place. He saw a Star rising out of Jacob ; he saw a scepter rising out of Israel, and smiting through the corners of Moab, and breaking down all the sons of tumult. Numerous instances occur.

4. Dates. Collateral with the preceding is the subordinate importance which prophecy attaches to dates. The chronological datum usually is simply "in that day," or "in the last days," without saying precisely when. In a few instances, however, more emphasis is placed upon the time of fulfillment, as in Ezek. xii. 28; Dan. ix.; Isa. xvi. 14; xxi. 16. Every one knows with what frequency the indefinite expressions '*acherith* and *hayyom hahu*' occur. In the short prophecy of Zechariah alone the latter expression is found in this indefinite sense no less than thirteen times: one side of the picture of "that day" being a description as vivid, as intense and awful, as the famous *Dies Irae*, while the other is the wilderness and solitary place already made glad, and the desert blossoming with roses.

5. Grouping of events. In lieu of definite chronological statement as to the exact time when an event shall take place, prophecy groups the events which it predicts according to their necessary chronological order. A certain event shall transpire, and this shall be succeeded by another, and this again by another, and so on; the exact time-when of now being given. In its predictive element prophecy generally looks far ahead to the consummation of the kingdom of God. In other words, its ultimate object is the fulfillment of God's purpose of salvation in "the last days;" its immediate object being salvation as a process, or "the way in which God conducts his purpose of salvation from the actual present to its fulfillment or appointed end." Hence, it looks to the past and the present, only that it may look to the future, having need, in its references to the latter, not of exact dates, but only of the order of succession. In prophetic vision we have first *guilt*, then *retribution*, and lastly *redemption*, its dark cloud always being encircled with a rainbow. But the exact times of the retribution and redemption are not given. The judgment is first upon Israel, then upon the world. The deliverance is first from Assyria, or Babylon, or other world-power happening to be dominant at the time, but which in the end becomes suggestive of deliverance under the Messianic reign; the near future being thus combined, or blended, in the prophet's thought, with the far future; as the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish economy are combined in prophetic vision with the end of the world. This is what is sometimes called the perspective character of prophecy. The seer looks from hill-top to further hill-top; nor are we required to suppose that in every case he could determine whether the object, or group of objects, was on a nearer hill-top or the one beyond. He saw it; but he knew not exactly where. This characteristic belongs to New Testament prophecy no less than to the Old. Paul knew that the Lord would come; but between himself and that event he saw the great apostacy; he knew not how far off was either event.

6. The realization. The prophet sees the realization of the matter of prophecy in particular events which are complete in themselves. E. g.: In Joel iii. the outpouring of the Spirit on the people of God is presented in the prophetic intuition as a single act, which the prophet may have thought exhausted the prophecy; so also the judgment of the end of the world is presented as a single act of judgment taking place in the valley of Jehoshephat. Whereas, the fulfillment is really a process of long and gradual development; the one outpouring, or the one judgment, being only a link of the long unbroken chain, or a grand culmination of a series of similar events. This has been called the law of dilation, though speaking of it with reference to the prophet's own point of view, it would be better called the law of visual compression. Many objects seen from far away appear to be compressed into one; but as we draw nearer to them, they appear, as

they really are, more than one. Perhaps the church has not yet seen all the outpourings of the Spirit which Joel describes as compressed into one.

7. Apparent contradiction. Another peculiarity of prophecy is the frequent apparent contradiction of the matter of one prophecy by that of another. E. g.: One prophet looks to the future, and reports the Messiah as the Prince of Peace. Another reports him as a warlike hero. At one time he is a secular ruler; and at another, the Servant of Jehovah, atoning for the sins of his people. The fact in the case is that prophecy recognizes, whether the prophet in every instance recognized it or not, that before there can be peace there must be war; before the ploughshare and the pruning-hook must be the sword and the spear. Before reconciliation there must be expiation. Prophecy looks at one time on this side, at another time on that. It presents, in these cases of apparent contradiction, the particular as particular, and not in its connections. But all the lines of vision converge to one and the same object, which in the illustrative case taken is the one Jesus of Nazareth. The Jewish interpreter, from the beginning, has stumbled here, because he did not detect the point of convergence.

8. Its form. Another characteristic of prophecy is the readiness with which it accommodates itself to the plane of the people. Its subject-matter is couched in current terms. It receives its coloring from the prophet's own age and from the circumstances of his times. The future kingdom of God (e. g.) is presented as an extended and glorified form of the theocracy, with which both prophet and people are familiar,—and this seems to be at least one providential use which God made of the persistent desire of the people in Samuel's time to have a king and a kingdom. The kingdom granted them became ever afterward a kind of object-lesson, or illustration. The king of the kingdom of God is another David. Prophecy is furnished with concrete terms in which to express its abstract, or spiritual, ideas. It was too soon yet to say "The kingdom of God is within you." The admission of other nations into the kingdom of God is represented as the nations traveling in unbroken stream to Mount Zion. (Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1, 2.) The world hostile to the kingdom of God is represented as the enemies of Israel,—Assyria, Moab, Edom, or whichever one happened to be the dominant one at the particular time, or whichever one happened to be regarded as the permanent and representative enemy. Did the prophet, however, understand it all thus? Perhaps not. The diction he employed in such cases as above mentioned was not conscious symbolism. If Assyria, or Moab, or Babylon, was spoken of, Assyria, or Moab, or Babylon was meant. The form of the mold into which the truth is cast, in order that the abstract may become concrete, and the spiritual become visible, is determined by the peculiar historical surroundings. But the literal Israel, Assyria, Babylon, was the mold into which another Israel, Assyria, Babylon was cast, the nature of which even the prophet himself, to say nothing of the average Hebrew, may not have clearly perceived. Nor is it strange that it should have been so. To speak to any age in the language of the future is to speak to it in a strange tongue. The future, to every age, is the projection of its present. We describe heaven and "the outer darkness" in terms of earth. When the child sings,

"There is a happy land, far, far away,"

the child understands it, doubtless, in a purely literal sense; and all that wiser ones can make of it is that it means something good.

9. Its symbolism. But prophecy does employ a symbolical covering, and to such an extent as to render it one of its peculiarities. It is conscious and intentional on the part of the prophet. The valley of dry bones was not literally a valley of dry bones, and Ezekiel knew that it was not. The horseman and horses among the myrtles were not literal horseman and horses, and Zechariah knew they were not. "Then said I, O my lord, what are these?" Instances abound, particularly in the prophecies of the exilic and restoration periods.

IV.

One more question remains to be asked. How did the prophet know that he was a prophet? What circumstance was it which, in his own consciousness, gave authority to his word? The fact that gave or helped to give him authority with *the people* was the fact that he was a member of a recognized and influential institution which came into prominence in the days of Samuel. At the time of Elijah, or Isaiah, or the later prophets, it had long ago become gray with years; and therefore the institution itself "to man was godlike," aside from any personal weight of character which any individual member of it might have. The prophet, as we have seen, was the educated and wise man of the day, the counselor not only of the people, but of the kings also. He wore the mantle of his office; and whether a true prophet or a false one, exacted and received the respect due to his office. It was not a strange thing, therefore, that both kings and people should have been misled by false prophets; and however censurable the former may have been, the latter were always more so. "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord. . . . Behold I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the Lord, and [or but] I will gather the remnant of my flock out of the countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds." (Jer. xxiii. 1 seq.) But while the people may not always have been able to distinguish between the true prophets and the false, the true prophet had more than the outward sign. He carried within him a prophetic consciousness that he was right, which rendered him twice armed and doubly strong. Nor was this conviction merely of ordinary or natural origin, such as might have been shared by the false prophet. It was from above. It was peculiar to the true prophet. He did not know himself to be a prophet, merely because of a conscious possession of any natural gifts,—for even the false prophet may have recognized in himself the presence of natural gifts; not because he had been educated in any of the schools of the prophets,—for not all prophets had been so educated; not because of any predilection which he may have had for the prophetic office,—for not all prophets had such predilection. Jeremiah shrank from it. "Ah, Lord God! behold I cannot speak; for I am a child." But the true prophet knew himself to be such by virtue of a divine call, as the true minister of the gospel to-day knows it, and by his endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying and strengthening Spirit of God. Thus the prophet knew that what he proclaimed was the word of God; and he could not withhold it. (Jer. xx. 9.) "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of them that are taught," said Isaiah, "that I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary; he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as them that are taught." (L. 4.) "The Lord God hath spoken; who can but prophesy?" (Amos iii. 8.)

But the false prophets, many of whom doubtless had been members of the schools, and all of whom doubtless wore the badge of office, spoke lying divination,

after the manner of the heathen, out of their own hearts. (2 Kgs. xvii. 17; Jer. xiv. 14; Ezek. xiii. 7.) They followed their own spirit, and were like foxes in the waste places. They went not up into the gaps, neither made up the fence for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. (Ezek. xiii. 5.) Not so with the prophets the records of whose ministries we study, and like unto whom, in all essential respects, God grant that we may be.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

FEB. 13. GOD'S COVENANT WITH ABRAM. Gen. xv. 5-18.

Professor Künen (*Hexateuch*, original pages 141, 314, etc.) holds that this account is made up of two previous accounts, with some later additions. First, there was a narrative, now represented by verses 2-4, 5, 6, 13-16, which told of an interview of Jehovah with Abram by night, Jehovah promising him an heir and a numerous seed. There was another narrative, now represented by verses 7-11, 12, 17, which told of an interview in the afternoon, of Jehovah's promising an inheritance to Abram, and of a sacrifice and covenant. A compiler roughly pieced these two narratives together. Some centuries later, an editor worked into the narrative a few such phrases as "who shall come forth from thy bowels," "great substance," "good old age" (verses 4, 14, 15), with the limit of time to the "fourth generation," verse 16. Still later some subsequent editor introduced the contradictory time-statement, the 400 years of verse 13, and either introduced or extended the list of nations, verses 19-21. Of the alleged peculiar expressions, the word *rakush*, substance, is limited in use to Genesis, Exodus, and the latest Old Testament books; the others have no such limit.

This is a very complicated way of accounting for the phenomena presented, and the complexity of it increases when we examine the details. One who holds that the chapter now stands substantially as it was originally written has at hand explanations of the phenomena which are at once much simpler and much more complete. The transaction took some time, the beginning of the interview being at night, and the sacrifice taking place in the afternoon of a subsequent day. The author represented Jehovah as promising to Abram both an heir and an inheritance, the two being thought of and spoken of together. The most natural interpretation of the 400 years makes it to be a round number, describing a period closing about 400 years from the time when the words were spoken, while the fourth generation would be counted from the time of the beginning of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt; the two time-statements, therefore, are consistent, and both are correct. An earlier author was just as likely as a later to give a longer list of nations than usual. The word *rakush* can be accounted for as an early word, revived by the late writers who use it, they being close students of the Pentateuch. The other phraseology that is here cited as peculiar to the style of the priestly narrator is not thus peculiar, but belongs to the current Hebrew of the earlier times.

The 400 years of this chapter elsewhere appears as exactly 430 years, Exod. XII. 40, 41; Gal. III. 17. My own opinion is that the 430 years begins with Abram's coming from Haran to Palestine, and therefore that just half of the time had expired before Jacob went to Egypt to sojourn. The four generations in Egypt may be represented by the names of Kohath, Amram, Aaron, and Eleazar, or by those of Levi, Kohath, Amram, Aaron. In any case, they are not human generations of average length, but generations of exceptionally long-lived men, the four covering a period of 215 years.

The word *believed*, in verse 6, is of great theological interest. The New Testament doctrine of faith comes back to this verse as its principal original instance.

In verses 1 and 4, the phrase "word of Jehovah" is used in describing the divine message to Abram, just as it would be used in the case of any prophet. Undoubtedly, the intention is to attribute to Abram the possession of the prophetic gift. It is said in verse 1 that the word of Jehovah came to Abram "in the vision," the word for vision being *machazeh*. Writers say that the derivatives of *chazah* and of *ra'ah* are used interchangeably in describing the visions of Jehovah's prophets. It would be more correct to say that they are sometimes used in the same passages, and that both are used of prophetic gifts, and as synonyms for the words that denote prophesying. *Ra'ah* is the ordinary word for physical beholding, while *chazah* properly denotes either mental sight, or thoughtful, observant seeing. When the words are applied to prophetic vision, the radical difference never wholly disappears. Visions that are conceived of as appealing to the external eye are described by the words of the stem *ra'ah*; the words of the stem *chazah* are either used generically, or specify visions of insight. The few apparent exceptions to this rule will be found, on examination, to confirm the rule. In the present chapter, for instance, if either word were used to describe Abraham's beholding of the fire that passed between the parts of the sacrifice, it would be a word from *ra'ah*. The word vision in verse 1 either describes the whole transaction, including the appearing of the fire, or else describes the beginning of the transaction as a revelation to Abraham by insight, and not by external vision.

FEB. 20. ABRAHAM PLEADING FOR SODOM. Gen. XVIII. 23-33.

The Old Testament view of Jehovah's mode of communicating with a man who had the gift of prophecy is better illustrated in these parts of the history of Abraham than in almost any other portion of Scripture. The modes of divine revelation to the prophets are commonly classified, I believe, as three: by dreams, by visions, and by direct communication. It follows more closely the language of the Bible to say by dreams, by external visions real or apparent, by mental vision. The highest mode of revelation is through that form of external vision which may be called theophany—Jehovah appearing in human form and conversing with a man, as in the instance in the present lesson, or Jehovah's uttering words to men from the midst of some splendid manifestation of his presence, as in the instance of the burning bush, or of the giving of the ten commandments from Sinai.

Of the first of these two kinds of theophany the lesson gives the most detailed instance we have. Note the following points concerning it. First, it purports to be an account of Jehovah's appearing to Abraham, verse 1. Secondly, Abraham saw three men, verse 2. Thirdly, he addressed one of them for the three, verse 3 seq.; according to the Massoretic pointing, he recognized the one as Jehovah. Fourthly, "they ate"—apparently all three of them, verse 8. Fifthly, one of the

three was Jehovah, and talked with Abraham both about himself and Sarah and about Sodom, verses 10, 13, 17, 22, 33, etc. Sixthly, the other two of the three men went toward Sodom, and are evidently "the two angels" whom Lot entertained there, verse 22 and XIX. 1, 5, 10, etc. There can be no doubt that we have here the description of Jehovah and two angels, in the form of three men, and an account of a conversation between Jehovah in this form and Abraham. In the parallel cases, sometimes one angel appears in the form of a man, and presently turns out to be Jehovah himself.

The theophanies of the Old Testament should be studied, both for their connection with the New Testament doctrine of the Incarnation, and for the light they throw on all points connected with the claims to divine authority made by the ancient prophets.

FEB. 27. DESTRUCTION OF SODOM. Gen. XIX. 15-26.

Our current traditions locate the cities of the plain within the present area of the Dead Sea, and generally in the southern and shallower part of it. But the line of march of the four kings, Gen. XIV., is inconsistent with this, and the opinion now best received is that the cities were to the north of the sea, in the deep Jordan valley.

It is still commonly held that the destruction of the cities was by miracle. It can be very plausibly accounted for, however, by purely natural causes. It is a rock oil region, and on the edge of a geological "fault." The sudden sinking of a tract of land, causing vast quantities of inflammable fluids to spurt upwards, with the ignition of these fluids, and their fall upon the devoted cities, would be phenomena not unlikely to happen in that locality; and if this happened, how could it be better described than by saying that "Jehovah rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from with Jehovah from the heaven?" such a use of providential means for accomplishing moral purposes is a more wonderful act of God than is any miracle. And in any case the saving of Lot and his family was by miracle.

When Lot went out of his house to face the mob in Sodom, he proved himself to be a man of physical courage. The Bible always speaks of him as a just man. I must think that the current interpretation of verses 7 and 8 does him injustice. Lot did not propose to compromise with the mob by sacrificing the honor of his daughters, but reasoned with them by the argument that they might as well ask him to consent to the dishonor of his daughters as to that of his guests.

The phrase "and he lingered," verse 16, gives the true key to the weakness in Lot's character which caused his failure in life. He had a habit of hesitating when he ought to have been acting. He lacked decision of purpose. If he had been more decided in his control of his servants, doubtless he and Abraham need not have parted. He showed an undecided, compromising spirit when he "tentled as far as Sodom," XII. 12, and finally became a resident there. From the story of Lot in Sodom, teach the importance of promptly saying "No" to temptation, and promptly saying "Yes" to duty.

MARCH 6. ABRAHAM OFFERING ISAAC. Gen. XXII. 1-14.

By what mode of communication Jehovah told Abraham to offer Isaac, we are not informed. The interference at the mountain was apparently by a theophany, in which the one speaking to Abraham is called both the angel of Jehovah and Jehovah, though this is not quite so clear in this case as in some other cases.

In verse 14, we get the clearest meaning if we translate "In the Mountain of Jehovah he will appear." This is one great lesson of the incident. Jehovah did not appear in theophany for Abraham's relief before Abraham started, nor while he was on the way, but after he had reached the mountain, and proceeded to the last extreme in obeying the command laid upon him. Similar facts were true in the experience of the men who framed the proverb. Jehovah sometimes delays appearing for our relief until we are in the last extremity, in the Mountain of Jehovah. Those who reason that we have in this "Mountain of Jehovah" an allusion to Solomon's temple, and therefore a proof that the book was written after Solomon's time draw a baseless conclusion.

No one should fail to notice that, in the successive incidents from which the lessons are taken the soteriological aspect of the call of Abraham, the thought that he and his seed are to be the channel of God's blessing to all mankind, is constantly kept in the foreground, as the principal doctrine taught in regard to God's relations with men, Gen. XVIII. 18, XXII. 18, etc.

AN EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH LIII. 11, 12.

BY BENJAMIN DOUGLASS,
Chicago, Ill.

The two verses closing this remarkable chapter were spoken by God the Father. The prophet's words in the preceding ten verses show, Godward, the humiliation of the God-man; and the imputation of human sin, equal to an indictment against Him; and manward, a trial of Jesus. A court on earth has tried him on the pretence of treason, and sentenced him to death upon the demand of the people, though judicially declared innocent. A court in heaven seems to be now convened, because of the permitted execution of this death sentence, and because great results, REACHING THROUGH ETERNITY, are to issue in benefit to man and glory to God; and a compensating reward is promised to the God-man, Sufferer and Mediator. The Judge of this heavenly court renders a decision which is summed up in these two verses.

Paraphrased they may be made to say: Verse 11, Because of the grief of his soul he shall see, in answer to the question, "Who shall declare his generation?" that which you, Isaiah, just now predicted (verse 10), "a seed," which shall "prolong its days," and he shall be satisfied fully and eternally therewith. On his acknowledgment, or confession [with love is implied], of "the multitudes" of this seed, he, the Father, as a judicial verdict, will pronounce it fit and proper to impute the righteousness of his servant to these multitudes, seeing that he himself shall bear their iniquities. Verse 12: Therefore I will apportion to him "on account of these multitudes," "and with numerous ones" [not strong, except as to numbers] shall he divide a spoil, because that he poured out his soul unto death and was numbered with the transgressors; and he bore the sin of many, and for the transgressors he shall make intercession [the verb is properly in the future] as long as there is any need, i. e., through this economy and that of the millennium, until the perfect state beyond comes, when intercession shall be no longer needed. The Tree of Life will be then accessible, and its leaves shall be for the service [not healing] of the nations then existing (Rev. XXII. 2).

The "seed" whose days are to be "prolonged" indefinitely, and which is spoken of as being the Father's "pleasure," and that is to "prosper" in his hand, is not a figurative and spiritual seed, as Alexander says; but is, as we see from other passages, that cleansed, adopted, and endlessly multiplying portion of the race of man, in the flesh, which will follow the advent of the new heavens and new earth. It is the nations of them which are saved (Rev. XXI. 24, 26), with their flow of "offspring" in the new world (Isa. LXV. 23). One thousand years prior to this time the Elect Church, in spiritual bodies, will have been gathered and given to Christ, as his bride. The Church cannot, therefore, be the seed; for its members neither marry nor are given in marriage, nor can they multiply. The Church is something *sui generis*; all things considered, a "petite affaire;" limited as to numbers, and peculiar every way. It is taken out of the passing generations, precedent to the return of the Lord; and its composing members are to be co-heirs and co-kings with Christ. The seed represents the subjects, the endlessly multiplying (Jer. XXXIII. 22) race, over whom the co-kings are to reign in their cleansed state in the New World.

I think that Alexander and Green are wrong in making the personal suffix of *bedha'to* objective, and rendering the word "in the knowledge of him." They think it brings out a truer and better meaning so to render it. I think not. In the solemn crisis here depicted, Jesus' owning and confessing the nations then existing, with their offspring, as his, seeing that he will then assume his second-Adam headship, seems the one essential thing! Moreover, I would always regard the noun-suffixes as designating the genitive case and never the accusative, unless the sense forced it so, which would be very seldom.

Yadha' means, in certain connections, to own, to acknowledge; and the word is rendered by this last expression six times in our English Bible, and this rendering is approved by our best scholars. Keil and Delitzsch and Cheyne among others. "To acknowledge" is a synonym of "to confess." Hence we see a relation which the lexicographers and commentators have overlooked, seemingly, between *yadhah* and *yadha'*. This is plain in Ps. XXXII. 5, where the two verbs follow each other in successive clauses, repeating the same idea, viz., I will "acknowledge" to thee my sin; I will "confess" my transgression.

Jesus has suffered death, (1) for the elect church, as seen in verses 4, 5 and 6 of this chapter, and (2) to procure cleansing and pardon for the perpetual generations of the seed, the two classes which he represented. The first class who (Matt. x. 32) had confessed him before men, he confesses before his Father who is in heaven at his second advent; and a thousand years later on, i. e., on the coming of the new heaven and new earth, he confesses the "multitudes" comprising the second class, the "seed" and their "offspring" with them, Isa. LXV. 23; and the Father then awards them the "cleansing," Joel III. 21, which the imputed righteousness of their, ever after to be, federal head necessitates and warrants. The confession of the first class will be made while he and they are in heaven. The confession of the second class will be made while they are, as they always will be, on the new earth.

Tsadhag means, in the Hiphil form, to declare just. On the expression *yats-diq tsaddiq 'abdi larabbim*, I would make *tsaddiq* the subject of the verb, *'abdi* the direct object, and *larabbim*, as the preposition *l* indicates, the indirect. The distinctive accent on *tsaddiq* prevents the union of the same with *'abdi* as an adjective agreeing with it. I would translate the passage as follows: The right-

eous one [i. e., God the Father, acting as Judge] shall cause my servant [Christ] to be accounted righteousness "for the multitudes" [of the seed]. He is the righteousness of the seed as well as of the elect church. In this 11th verse the two parts of Christ's work for the seed are seen: (1) He bears their iniquities; (2) He will bring them into a state of perfect justification before God.

The twelfth verse: The time for the fulfillment of the promises made in this verse is not yet. It will not be, in its entirety, till the dispensation of the new heavens and the new earth. Meanwhile the millennial dispensation comes in between the close of this economy and the introduction of that final and perfect state. Satan's kingdom must first be destroyed. The God of peace "shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Rom. XVI. 20. The recovery of this "whole creation" back to its loyalty to God will be a marvelous achievement; and it is here contemplated as a victor's spoil. God, the Father, will allot a large portion of the universal kingdom to Christ for the use and occupancy of the foregoing "multitudes" with their "numerous" progeny. It will, probably, after a time, embrace all the worlds connected with our solar system. The consideration stated is "because that he poured out his soul unto death," becoming the atonement for sin, and the Saviour of the believing sinner.

Then the "sin" question having been finally settled and "Satan" gone, and "death" abolished, and the "curse" removed, and the glorification of all nature re-effected through the intervention of this One Man, "my servant," so that "old things" shall be forever done away, and "all things be made new," then, it is foretold, that the glory of God shall return and the light of one day shall be as the light of seven days combined; and the heavens shall show forth his righteousness and all the nations shall see his glory. Ps. XCVII. 6. Then, too, as Isaiah says, XLV. 8, the skies shall pour down righteousness, and he, the king himself, shall be known as "Jehovah our Righteousness;" and then and not before, impliedly, the Psalmist says CIV. 31, "Jehovah shall be GLAD in his works," for HIS KINGDOM, which is an impossible thing in such a scene as now exists, WILL HAVE COME.

THE ANTEDILUVIAN CHRONOLOGY.

BY GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D. D.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

The chronology of the fifth chapter of Genesis, and indeed of the antediluvian period generally, is a matter, let it be frankly admitted, of considerable uncertainty. The Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint texts differ by centuries. These differences have not been wholly reconciled. Nor is it needful that they should be. It is not three centuries since the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock. Yet, notwithstanding the abundant contemporary records, it is uncertain whether they landed on the twenty-first or the twenty-second of December. But does any one doubt that they landed, and began the Christian civilization of the New World? Competent chronologists declare that Jesus Christ was born at least four years before the beginning of the era we call the Christian. Does that alter the blessed fact that the Son of God has really been born into the world, and so become the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him?

Again, it is not certain how we should interpret the genealogical table of the fifth chapter of Genesis. It is possible that the patriarchs whose names it records, instead of being directly consecutive sons, were only the prominent sons in several generations, or founders of separate patriarchal dynasties. Hence, according to the Bible itself, humanity itself may be tens of thousands of years old.

Once more, assuming, what on the whole seems to be the probability, that this fifth of Genesis is the record of individuals and not of dynasties, the genealogy yields some curious results. For example: Methuselah was contemporary with Adam some 243 years, and also with Shem some 98 years; Shem also was contemporary with Isaac some 50 years; so that during this period of some 2100 years between Adam and Isaac, Adam could have told the story of Eden to Methuselah, and Methuselah to Shem, and Shem to Isaac. Enoch himself, although the shortest lived of the patriarchs, was contemporary with Adam 300 years, and might have talked with all the patriarchs before the flood except Noah. Were the antediluvian longevity still prevalent, a man might say to his grandson to-day: "I was present at the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth." The writer mentions these facts, not only because they are interesting, but also because they show the extreme probability of the correctness of the patriarchal traditions concerning the creation, the fall, the flood, etc.

THE PRAYER OF HABAKKUK.

BY GEORGE A. BARTON, M. A.,

Friends' School, Providence, R. I.

The Prayer of Habakkuk is a poem written in the simplest and earliest of Hebrew meters, the trimeter. The following translation is an attempt to reproduce the poem in English, line for line, so as to exhibit its metrical structure. It will be observed that the poem is composed of five strophes, the first three of which consist of fourteen lines each, the last two, of eleven lines each. In this arrangement of the poem eleven Massoretic Mäqqēphs are disregarded, and nine Mäqqēphs are inserted. The structure of the poem is, on the whole, plain. A few points, however, deserve remark. Line 6 of the second strophe and line 9 of the fourth strophe have each five words, i. e., they each require two Mäqqēphs. Line 12 of the second strophe* is a dimeter. It seems to have been thrown in for variety. Line 2 of the fourth strophe† is also a dimeter. The third line of the fourth strophe is more difficult. It seems to consist of the one word 'alitsutham,‡ which cannot be regarded even as a dimeter, unless the secondary accent be counted as a full tone. In the following translation this line is rendered as though it were 'alitsutham kamo,§ instead of joining kamo to the next line by Mäqqēph, and the dimeters are all rendered as trimeters.

The poem is as follows:—

I have heard, O Yahweh, thy fame.
I have feared. Thy work, O Yahweh,
Revive in the midst of the years,

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִשְׁמָע. * כִּרְכַּבְתָּךְ יִשְׁמָע. † יִסְעֶרָ לְהַפִּיצָנִי. ‡ אֶל־צֹמְחָם. § אֶל־צֹמְחָם כָּמוֹ.

In the midst of the years make it known,
In wrath remember mercy.
God from Teman cometh,
The Holy One from Paran ;
His beauty covers the heavens,
The earth is full of his praise.
His splendor shines like light,
Rays come forth from his hand.
He covers his strength with a veil ;
Before him a pestilence cometh,
Lightnings flash from his fist.

He stood and measured the earth ;
He beheld and parted the nations.
Th' eternal mountains were scattered,
The hills everlasting were bowed ;
Of old are all his ways.
I saw Ethiopia troubled ;
Midian's tent-curtains quivered.
Was Yahweh wroth with rivers,
Enraged against the streams,
Or angry with the sea,
When he did ride his steeds,
His chariots of salvation ?
Thou didst lay bare thy bow ;
Thou didst swear chastisement.

Thou didst cleave the earth with rivers ;
Seeing thee, the mountains did writhe ;
The torrents of water passed by ;
The deep gave forth its voice,
Its hands on high it raised.
Sun and moon stood still where they dwell ;
By thine arrows' light they walked,
By the flash of thy glittering spear.
Thou didst traverse the land in rage,
Thou didst tread in wrath the nations ;
Thou didst go to save thy people,
For vict'ry with thine anointed.
Thou didst smile the house of deceit,
Stripping wall from summit to base.

His chiefs his own staves pierced :
They rushed like a storm upon me :
They gloried as does the one
Who devours in secret the poor.
Thou didst tread with horses the sea,
The foaming of mighty waters :
I heard, my bowels trembled,

At the voice my lips did quiver;
 I shook—my bones did rot:
 That I should await the woe,
 Which smites the invading troops.

Tho' the fig tree shall not bloom,
 And fruitless be the vine,
 The olive be tilled in vain,
 And the fields produce no food,
 The flocks waste from the fold,
 And herd cease from the stall,
 Yet in Yahweh will I rejoice.
 I'll glory in God, my Savior.
 My strength is Yahweh the Lord;
 My feet he has made like the hind's;
 On the heights will he make me walk.

REPORT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF SCHOOLS OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HEBREW.

To the Members of the American Institute of Hebrew:

The Principal of Schools herewith submits his second annual report. There will be considered in order, first, the work of the Correspondence School, secondly, the work of the Summer Schools, and thirdly, certain general matters connected with the work viewed as a whole.

I. THE CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL.

The Correspondence School has now finished its sixth year, during two of which it has been under the direction of the Institute of Hebrew. The feasibility of teaching by correspondence is no longer questioned by those who have examined either the process or the results, and the recognition of the correspondence method as a possible method of giving instruction is every year becoming more general.

1. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL.

	Elem.	Int.	Prog.	Arab.	Assyr.	Total.
1. Students in the School Jan. 1, 1886.....	374	189	120	683
2. Students entering during 1886.....	65	47	26	9	5	175
3. Students stopping work during 1886.....	81	39	14	134
4. Students graduated during 1886.....	34	21	21	76
5. Students sending in papers during 1886.....	231	132	72	9	5	450
6. Various denominations represented.....						32
7. States and countries, a) in United States and Canada						48
b) in other lands.....						11
8. Average age of men at work.....						33
9. Number of women in the School.....						18
10. Number of men not in the ministry.....						98
11. Number of men ready to take up the Advanced Course.....						130

2. WORK OF THE SCHOOL.

	Elem.	Int.	Prog.	Arab.	Assyr.	Total.
1. Number of Lesson-papers corrected in 1886...	2007	1463	773	45	25	4313
2. Number of Courses completed from begin....	104	70	45	219
3. Letters written in connection with Lessons..	356	201	109	666
4. Letters to delinquents and in general work...	922	314	262	1498

3. DELINQUENCY OF MEMBERS.

The interruptions which occur in the work of every minister occasion a large amount of delinquency. It is impossible, in the very nature of things, for men burdened as pastors are burdened to do work of this kind either as regularly or as rapidly as they would desire. One of the best students in the School has just finished a course begun in 1882. This is an extreme case. It illustrates, however, two things: (a) Men may be able to do but little each week; yet in time that little counts. (b) Men in the School, after once getting fairly started, do not confine their Hebrew work to the ground taken up in the Lessons, but in many cases study independently other portions of Scripture aside from the Lessons. The only remedy for this evil of delinquency lies in emphasizing the importance of the work, and in thus indirectly aiding the student to withstand all but the most important interruptions.

4. RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS.

The number of those who have given up the work without having completed a course is larger this year than last: (a) A larger number of deaths have occurred. (b) Several who were reckoned as members on the last report, although having sent in no Lessons for a year, were dropped from the list soon after the beginning of the year. (c) A very large number of men have taken up the study and continued it until an opportunity came to enter a Theological Seminary; and taking up the Hebrew work in the Seminary, there was neither time nor necessity for retaining membership in the Correspondence School. (d) Several gave up work because the tuition-fee heretofore paid by the course, was made payable annually. (e) Other causes for retirement have been failure of health, overpressure of regular duties, permanent appointment to some denominational work, discouragement, insufficient education, and poverty. As a result of this weeding-out process, the membership of the Correspondence School is now of a much more satisfactory character than ever before.

5. NUMBER OF LESSONS CORRECTED.

The number of Lessons corrected during this year is one-seventh less than that of the preceding year. In reality, however, one third more work has been done. As announced in the last annual report, new Instruction Sheets for both the Elementary and Intermediate courses have been prepared and used. These Instruction Sheets require almost double the amount of work for their preparation. It is certain that three of these Instruction Sheets require as much study as five of the old series. The 3470 Lessons corrected in the Elementary and Intermediate courses would, therefore, be equal to 5805 of last year's Lessons. Adding the Progressive Lessons which have been corrected, the total would be about 6578, as compared with 5062 of last year.

6. THE ADVANCED COURSE.

It was confidently expected that before this time the Advanced Course would have been started. At least one hundred and thirty men are waiting for it. The

necessity of rewriting the Instruction Sheets of the Elementary and Intermediate courses, together with other work of a pressing character, has rendered it impossible. Arrangements have been made looking to a beginning of work in this course early in the coming spring.

7. THE COURSES IN ARABIC AND ASSYRIAN.

At the urgent request of several who desired help in the study of these languages, instruction by correspondence was offered beginning November 1st. Already nine men are at work in Arabic, and five in Assyrian. This work is conducted without expense to the Institute, there being paid out for expense of printing, correcting of Lessons, etc., only the sums received for tuition.

8. ASSISTANTS IN THE CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL.

In the work of the Correspondence School, the Principal has been aided during the year by Mr. Frederic J. Gurney, Mr. C. Eugene Crandall, Mr. Robert F. Harper, and Rev. W. W. White, and for a short time by Rev. John W. Payne and Rev. C. K. Harrington. It is with sincere pain and regret that the Principal announces the withdrawal of Mr. Gurney from the work of the School in February last. The withdrawal was occasioned by an attack of nervous exhaustion, brought on, it is feared, by too close application to the severe and confining work of the Correspondence School. Since giving up his connection with the School he has been unable to do work of any kind. Mr. Gurney had a special and peculiar ability for the work, and to his labors in connection with the School is due, in large measure, its success. His withdrawal has been a severe loss, and has affected the progress of the School in no slight degree. Since Mr. Gurney's withdrawal the larger portion of the work of the School has been performed by Mr. Crandall, aided during the summer months by the Rev. John W. Payne, and by the Rev. C. K. Harrington. Since October, 1886, the Rev. W. W. White has been engaged in the work, and his connection will, it is hoped, be a permanent one.

To Mr. R. F. Harper has been committed the work of correcting the Examination-papers in Arabic and Assyrian.

The Principal desires to acknowledge his great indebtedness to these, his assistants, for their uniformly faithful and invaluable service.

9. CHANGE OF HEAD-QUARTERS.

During the year the head-quarters of the Correspondence School have been moved from Morgan Park, Ill., to New Haven, Conn. As a result of this change, the expense of carrying on the work has been somewhat increased; but the general advantages resulting from the change, it is believed, will more than counterbalance any additional expense.

10. CHANGE OF TUITION-FEE.

Until this year the fee for tuition was ten dollars for each course. By this plan a student might remain a member of the School for any number of years by the payment of a single fee, sending in Lessons at intervals as widely separated as he might choose to make them. It will be readily seen that the complications growing out of the plan were numerous. In February last a change was instituted by which the fee for instruction was made six dollars a year instead of ten dollars a course. It was provided further that forty Lessons should constitute a year's work. This plan has been found to possess many advantages over the old

one, and while its inauguration has been attended with much expense and trouble, the results already apparent have justified its adoption.

II. PRIZES FOR THE LARGEST NUMBER OF LESSONS.

In order to stimulate the members of the School to the preparation of the largest possible number of Examination-papers, four prizes of books to the amount of \$20, \$15, \$10 and \$5 respectively, were offered to the students sending in the greatest number of Papers with grade as high as eight (on a scale of ten), between and including April 1 and December 31, 1886. The prizes have been awarded as follows:

The first to the Rev. J. H. Murphy, Cavan, Ireland, the average of whose Papers was 9.65.

The second to Prof. G. F. Nicolassen, Clarksville, Tenn., the average of whose Papers was 9.5.

The third to the Rev. S. E. Jones, Huntington, W. Va., the average of whose Papers was 9.35.

The fourth to the Rev. J. T. McColm, Goshen, Va., the average of whose Papers was 9.2.

These prizes have been kindly contributed by friends of the work.

II. THE SUMMER SCHOOLS.

Under the direction of the Institute of Hebrew, five Schools were held, viz., at Philadelphia, June 7th–July 3d; at Morgan Park, June 28th–July 24th; at Newton Centre, July 19th–August 14th; at Chautauqua, August 2d–28th; at the University of Virginia, August 16th–September 11th.

For the details of the various Schools the Principal would refer to the accompanying special reports of the several Committees.*

A few general points may here be considered:—

1. The Instructors engaged in the various Schools were

Prof. J. J. Anderson, Holland, Mich.	Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.
" W. G. Ballantine, D. D., Oberlin, O.	" W. W. Lovejoy, Philadelphia, Pa.
" W. J. Beecher, D. D., Auburn, N. Y.	" B. Manly, D. D., Louisville, Ky.
" E. C. Bissell, D. D., Hartford, Conn.	" W. W. Moore, D. D., Hampden Sidney, Va.
" Francis Brown, D. D., New York City.	" D. A. McClenahan, M. A., Allegheny, Pa.
" C. R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.	" J. P. Peters, Ph. D., Philadelphia, Pa.
" S. Burnham, D. D., Hamilton, N. Y.	" F. M. Peterson, M. A., Greensboro, Ala.
" J. A. Cralg, Ph. D., Cincinnati, O.	" G. H. Schodde, Ph. D., Columbus, O.
Mr. C. E. Crandall, M. A., New Haven, Conn.	" J. R. Sampey, B. A., Louisville, Ky.
Prof. E. L. Curtis, Ph. D., Chicago, Ill.	" H. P. Smith, D. D., Cincinnati, O.
" F. B. Denio, M. A., Bangor, Me.	" B. C. Taylor, M. A., Chester, Pa.
" Holmes Dysinger, M. A., Newbury, S. C.	" J. P. Taylor, M. A., Andover, Mass.
" R. V. Foster, D. D., Lebanon, Tenn.	" M. S. Terry, D. D., Evanston, Ill.
" W. H. Green, D. D., Princeton, N. J.	" C. H. Toy, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.
" W. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn.	Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D., New York City.
" Alvah Hovey, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.	Prof. R. F. Weidner, D. D., Rock Island, Ill.
Mr. Geo. Hovey, B. A., Newton Centre, Mass.	" D. M. Welton, D. D., Toronto, Can.
Prof. Morris Jastrow, Ph. D., Philadelphia, Pa.	" R. D. Wilson, M. A., Allegheny, Pa.
" J. G. Lansing, D. D., New Brunswick, N. J.	

2. The membership of the Schools included two hundred and five men. Only those who were present at one of the Schools can appreciate the earnest spirit exhibited by the men. They were men who felt keenly the importance of a deeper

* These reports have not been published.

and broader preparation for the study of the Old Testament. They were men whose influence and example will prove of great service in the future work of the Institute of Hebrew. The large classes in the more important cognate languages attest a growing interest in Semitic study, an interest which only needs encouragement and opportunity to develop still much more widely.

3. An interesting feature of the summer's work was the fact that in many cases the same individual attended two Schools. Some attended the Philadelphia and Chicago Schools; others the Chicago and New England Schools; others the Chicago and Chautauqua Schools, and still others the Chicago and Southern Schools.

4. But especially worthy of note was the feeling, which seemed a universal one, that to accomplish the work desired, the Institute must continue its present policy of holding Schools in different localities. Whenever the suggestion was made that perhaps more could be done by uniting the several Schools in one large School, it was opposed most strenuously. This feeling was shared alike by students and instructors. It is a common opinion that the end in view, viz., the awakening of greater interest in Old Testament and Semitic studies, can be brought about by selecting important centres in the various divisions of the country and working out from these. Anything like an effort to establish the work at one centre would meet with general disapproval and regret on the part of those most deeply interested.

A School was organized at the University of Virginia with the understanding that five hundred dollars should be raised and a guarantee of 40 students be given. The money was received and, while the guarantee was not fully met, a sufficient number attended and paid tuition-fees to cover all expenses.

5. The Southern School owes its existence to the interest and self-sacrifice of one man, the Rev. J. M. Rawlings, of Lynchburg, Va., who contributed five hundred dollars toward the expenses of the School. Mr. Rawlings was led to take this step after having attended the New England School in the summer of 1885. It was a matter of great satisfaction to see that his efforts to establish a School were appreciated by Southern ministers. From the present outlook the Southern School promises to outstrip all others the coming summer.

III. THE WORK IN GENERAL.

1. THE PRINTED MATERIAL USED.

In prosecuting the work of the various Schools there have been used :

1. 12,620 sheets of letter paper, with printed letter-head.
2. 1,810 printed application forms.
3. 4,550 printed instruction cards and statement.
4. 45,200 envelopes with printed advertisement.
5. 8,538 printed letters.
6. 366,023 pages of circulars.
7. 8,356 dictated letters.
8. 1,328 written letters.

In this connection a statement from the last report may be repeated :

This may seem to be a large amount of general work,—too large perhaps in view of the results. Yet here we must consider,

1. The comparative newness of the work, and, as a consequence of this, the necessity of a large amount of *pushing*, which is demanded to make it succeed.

The work of the Institute is not a local, but a national, and even an international, work, and as such must be made known.

2. The peculiarity of the work, so large a portion of it being *correspondence-work*. Teaching by correspondence must, in its very nature, require the use of much printed matter, the writing of many letters.

3. The large number of men with whom correspondence must be conducted. The whole number of men from whom letters pertaining to the work of the Institute were received and to whom letters were written during the past year, not including those to whom *printed* letters were sent, exceeded 2000.

4. The great amount of correspondence involved in arranging for the instruction, the lectures, and the detail of each School, in answering questions concerning the classes, the hours, the books and the teachers in various Schools, in securing the money needed for the endowment-fund of the Institute, in following up delinquents, in encouraging those who are discouraged. A careful consideration of all these things must soon satisfy one that the work of pushing, arranging and holding together cannot be accomplished except at the expenditure of time, money, and strength.

2. THE PRINCIPAL'S WORK.

Since the Principal is paid for his services by the Institute of Hebrew, a more or less exact statement of these services may be expected :

1) He has done 425 hours of class-room work in the five Summer Schools, giving his entire time to the work of the Schools from June 7th-September 11th, fourteen weeks.

2) He has traveled about 6700 miles, while engaged in the Institute's work.

3) He has done, besides the class-room work, six hundred hours of office work,

4) As a portion of the office work he has written for the Institute 8356 dictated letters. These letters were written (a) In reply to inquiries received concerning the various Schools. (b) To students in the Correspondence School, in relation to their work, and to difficulties with which they were troubled. (c) To delinquents in the Correspondence School, i. e., men who for various reasons were not at work. (d) To the gentlemen who were to give instruction in the various Summer Schools. (e) To men whose names were suggested by members of the School. (f) In connection with the endowment fund. (g) In connection with other routine work.

5) He has secured all the new subscriptions made this year to the Endowment Fund.

3. THE ENDOWMENT FUND.

Of the entire sum of contributions, \$4881, only \$3156 have come from the Endowment Fund. In other words, those persons who paid in last year \$3937, have paid in this year \$781 less. Of this sum about one half is good, though not yet collected. The remaining \$1725 is to be classified under the head of new subscriptions, \$500 of it having been given by one person, Rev. J. M. Rawlings, with the stipulation that it should be used for the Southern School.

The work of raising this extra sum, after the severe effort of two years ago, has been very great. Nor was it obtained in time to prevent the necessity of negotiating a loan in order to pay the summer bills of the Institute. The deficiency in the amount received from the Endowment Fund proper is due to the death of some donors, the financial inability of some, and the indifference of oth-

ers. It may be expected that each year there will be needed from \$1200 to \$1500 of new subscriptions. In securing this sum the co-operation of the members of the Institute is greatly to be desired.

4. THE INSTITUTE FELLOWSHIPS.

At the last annual meeting of the Institute the Principal was authorized to announce that persons who should satisfactorily pass examinations in certain subjects should be elected Fellows of the Institute of Hebrew. The general details of the plan were arranged by the Executive Committee and announced by the Principal. In return applications were received from several persons indicating their desire to undertake preparation for the examinations. Several, indeed, presented themselves at the various Summer Schools for the examinations; but inasmuch as the exact nature of the examinations had been left undetermined by the Executive Committee, it was deemed best by the Principal to postpone such examinations until the details could more definitely be arranged. At least thirty men are now at work preparing themselves for such examinations when they shall be offered. This feature of the Institute's work is one which will in time prove to be one of the most important.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS.

In the interests of the work in general the Principal desires to make the following recommendations:

1. That the individual members of the Institute be urged to take a more active part in securing funds to cover the expenses of the work now being carried on by the Institute. It is too much to expect that this work shall be done by one man. The fact that each member of the Institute has obligations resting upon him in other directions is appreciated; yet how easy it would be to secure the necessary means for this work if each one would but make an effort.

2. That Old Testament Professors encourage, so far as practicable, those whom they know are about to enter the Theological Seminary to take a course of instruction either in the Correspondence School or in one of the Summer Schools, and that for such they provide a special course of study. The experiment of providing such a special course has during the past year been tried by several Professors, and in every case it has been found to work most successfully.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM R. HARPER,

Principal.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HEBREW.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 25TH, 1886.

RECEIPTS.		DISBURSEMENTS.	
From Endowment Fund.....	\$4,881.00	CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL:	
" Tuition-fees in Cor. School.	1,253.53	Tuition refunded.....	\$ 38.00
" Tuition-fees in Philadelphia Summer School.....	210.00	Salaries.....	1,385.56
" Tuition-fees in New England Summer School.....	417.85	Printing and Stationery....	376.61
" Tuition-fees in Chicago Summer School.....	375.00	Advertising.....	56.88
" Tuition-fees in Southern Summer Schools.....	165.00	Postage.....	134.20
" Loans.....	1,650.00	General Expense.....	15.67
" Balance from '85.....	78.79		<u>\$2,006.92</u>
		PHILADELPHIA SUMMER SCHOOL:	
		Salaries.....	\$688.74
		Printing and Stationery....	58.82
		Advertising.....	35.00
		Postage.....	69.25
		General Expense.....	16.79
			<u>\$868.60</u>
		CHICAGO SUMMER SCHOOL:	
		Salaries.....	\$662.14
		Printing and Stationery....	53.89
		Advertising.....	35.00
		Postage.....	69.25
		General Expense.....	11.90
			<u>\$832.18</u>
		NEW ENGLAND SUMMER SCHOOL:	
		Salaries.....	\$679.64
		Printing and Stationery....	56.12
		Advertising.....	35.00
		Postage.....	69.25
		Gen. and Traveling Ex.....	117.31
			<u>\$957.32</u>
		SOUTHERN SUMMER SCHOOL:	
		Salaries.....	\$477.64
		Printing and Stationery....	53.87
		Advertising.....	35.00
		Postage.....	69.25
		General Expense.....	6.86
			<u>\$642.62</u>
		ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP ACCOUNT:	
		Printing and Postage	\$ 7.70
		Endowment Fund Expense.....	48.80
		Principal's Salary.....	1,200.00
		Executive Committee Expense of 1885..	71.60
		Institute Expenses, rent, interest, etc.	383.69
		Loans paid.....	1,550.00
		Balance due on Salaries of 1885.....	258.00
			<u>\$8,827.43</u>
		Balance on hand.....	203.74
			<u>\$9,031.17</u>
	<u>\$9,031.17</u>		
ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
Cash on hand	\$ 203.74	Loans.....	\$700.00
Endowment Fund due (estimated)....	390.00	Salaries due.....	189.19
Tuition-fees due (estimated)	238.50		
Printed Matter.....	65.00		
	<u>\$ 897.24</u>		
Excess of Liabilities over Assets.....	\$1.95		
	<u>\$ 889.19</u>		<u>\$889.19</u>

The Committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's Report have examined the accounts and found them correct, with vouchers corresponding.

JOHN P. PETERS,
FRANCIS BROWN,
CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

DONORS AND DONATIONS.

Anderson, Prof. J. J., Holland, Mich.....	\$ 50.00	Graham, James, Preparation, Iowa.....	\$5.00
Atwood, O. E., Blue Island, Ill.....	20.00	Grover, W. O., Boston, Mass.....	100.00
Banker, Rev. J. B., Benfon Harbor, Mich.....	2.00	Hamilton, Jno. M., Coudersport, Pa.....	9.30
Barney, E. J., Dayton, O.....	25.00	Harper, Prof. W. R., New Haven, Conn.....	400.00
Bartlett, Rev. F. W., Syracuse, N. Y.....	2.00	Henderson, A. M., Chicago, Ill.....	25.00
Beecher, Prof. Willis J., Auburn, N. Y.....	25.00	Henderson, Rev. J. A., Kenton, O.....	5.00
Bissell, Prof. E. C., Hartford, Conn.....	5.00	Henry, Rev. Geo. C., Des Moines, Ia.....	3.00
Boardman, Rev. G. D., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00	Hewitt, Rev. A. R., Weedsport, N. Y.....	3.00
Brooks, A., New York City, N. Y.....	5.00	Hill, S. Prentiss, Charlestown, Mass.....	5.00
Brown, Alex., Philadelphia, Pa.....	50.00	Holbrook, Z. S., Chicago, Ill.....	10.00
Brown, Prof. C. R., Newton Centre, Mass.....	100.00	Holden, C. N., Chicago, Ill.....	20.00
Burns, Rev. W. T., Camden, N. J.....	30.00	Jessup, Morris K., New York, N. Y.....	100.00
Burnham, Prof. S., Hamilton, N. Y.....	20.00	Jewell, Rev. Geo. C., Cortland, O.....	2.00
Burt, Rev. E. P., Buxton Centre, Me.....	1.00	Johnson, Prof. Herrick, Chicago, Ill.....	20.00
Butler, J. H., Philadelphia, Pa.....	5.00	Keen, Dr. W. W., Philadelphia, Pa.....	5.00
Cadwallader, G. C., Philadelphia, Pa.....	5.00	Kimberley, Geo., New Brunswick, N. J.....	10.00
Cash, Quiney Point, Mass.....	5.00	King, Chas. R., Philadelphia, Pa.....	25.00
Chapman, Rev. N. E., Waterville, Minn.....	5.00	Knapp, Rev. A. D., Mansfield, O.....	6.00
Charlton, Rev. Adam, Lynedoch, Ont.....	3.00	Landeeth, Oliver, Bristol, Pa.....	10.00
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ypsilanti, Mich.....	5.00	Landis, Prof. J. P., Dayton, O.....	20.00
Cissold, H. R., Morgan Park, Ill.....	25.00	Lansing, Prof. J. G., New Brunswick, N. J.....	20.00
Colfin, Rev. H. W., Morgan Park, Ill.....	1.00	Lewis, H. M., Philadelphia, Pa.....	20.00
Colby, Hon. Chas. L., Milwaukee, Wis.....	25.00	Lindsay, D. S., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00
Colby, Rev. H. F., Dayton, O.....	15.00	Lovejoy, Prof. W. W., Palmyra, N. J.....	35.00
Converse, E. W., Boston, Mass.....	20.00	McCague, Rev. T. M., Omaha, Neb.....	5.00
Converse, John H., Philadelphia, Pa.....	25.00	McClunabau, Prof. D. A., Allegheny, Pa.....	60.00
Converse, J. W., Boston, Mass.....	25.00	McCoey, Rev. J. N., Kenton, O.....	5.00
Cortelyan, P., New Brunswick, N. J.....	10.00	McDowell, Rev. J. Q. A., New Castle, Pa.....	10.00
Crandall, C. E., New Haven, Conn.....	10.00	McKee, Rev. W. P., Crawfordsville, Ind.....	5.00
Crundall, Ezra, Milton, Wis.....	25.00	McKibben, Prof. Geo. P., Granville, O.....	5.00
Crawford, Rev. Angus, Mt. Holly, N. J.....	25.00	McKisahan, Rev. W., Hookstown, Pa.....	50.00
Crozer, Geo. K., Chester, Pa.....	25.00	McVieker, Rev. W. N., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00
Crozer, S. A., Chester, Pa.....	25.00	McWilliams, D. W., New York, N. Y.....	300.00
Cummings, Rev. J. E., Newton Ctr. Mass.....	1.00	Mitchell, Rev. F. M., Jacksonville, Ill.....	5.00
Currier, Prof. A. N., Iowa City, Iowa.....	2.50	Monroe, Albert B., New York, N. Y.....	200.00
Curtis, Prof. Edw. L., Chicago, Ill.....	50.00	Moore, Prof. W. W., Hampden Sidney, Va.....	25.00
Dales, Rev. J. B., Philadelphia, Pa.....	50.00	Newton, R., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00
Dana, Rev. S. W., Philadelphia, Pa.....	25.00	Nordell, Rev. P. A., New London, Conn.....	10.00
Davis, Rev. G. W., Auburn, N. Y.....	5.00	Osgood, Prof. Howard, Rochester, N. Y.....	40.00
Day, Rev. S. H., Greenwich, R. I.....	4.00	Parker, Prof. L. F., Iowa City, Ia.....	2.50
Denio, Prof. F. B., Bangor, Me.....	25.00	Peters, Prof. Jno. P., Philadelphia, Pa.....	4.00
Denison, J. N., Boston, Mass.....	50.00	Porter, Rev. A., Sun Prairie, Wis.....	1.00
Dexter, Rev. H. M., Boston, Mass.....	10.00	Quincy, Geo. H., Boston, Mass.....	10.00
Dodd, Prof. T. J., Nashville, Tenn.....	10.00	Rainey, Wm., Cambridge, O.....	10.00
Dodge, Rev. J. S., New York, N. Y.....	50.00	Rawlings, Rev. J. M., Lynchburg, Va.....	500.00
Douglass, Benj., Chicago, Ill.....	300.00	Reichelt, Jno. A., Chicago, Ill.....	50.00
Dysinger, Prof. Holmes, Newberry, S. C.....	5.00	Rex, Rev. H. L., Bushkill, Pa.....	2.00
Duane, Rev. C. W., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00	Rhoads, Rev. Chas., Granville, Ohio.....	5.00
Du Bose, R., Philadelphia, Pa.....	5.00	Rhodes, Rev. W. C. P., Brooklyn, N. Y.....	5.00
Eccleston, I. H., Baltimore, Md.....	10.00	Richards, C. W., Oswego, N. Y.....	10.00
Ensley, Rev. N. H., Rodney, Miss.....	2.70	Robbins, Rev. J. H., Claremont, N. H.....	1.00
Everts, Rev. W. W., Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.....	25.00	Robert, H. M., Philadelphia, Pa.....	30.00
Ferguson, Rev. R. H., Newtoo Ctr. Mass.....	1.00	Robertson, Rev. P., Paris, Ky.....	10.00
Finney, Rev. T. J., Cairo, Egypt.....	5.00	Rockefeller, Jno. D., New York, N. Y.....	400.00
Foster, Prof. R. V., Lebanon, Tenn.....	10.00	Rogers, T. M., Philadelphia, Pa.....	10.00
Fox, Rev. J. W., Buda, Ill.....	6.00	Rollins, Rev. W. E., Evanston, Ill.....	3.00
Frazier, W. W., Philadelphia, Pa.....	50.00	Roy, Rev. James, Cobourg, Ont.....	1.00
Gaines, Mrs. G. K., Holland, Mich.....	10.00	Rust, H. A., Chicago, Ill.....	10.00
Gardner, Rev. C., Newton Centre, Mass.....	1.00		
Goodman, Edw. L., Chicago, Ill.....	50.00		
Goodspeed, Rev. G. S., Springfield, Mass.....	5.00		

Safford, Rev. DeForest, Jamaica, Vt.	6.00	Wallace, Prof. Jas. Wooster, O.	5.00
Salsman, Rev. F. J., Newton C'tre Mass.	1.00	Warren, S. D., Boston, Mass.	100.00
Sanders, Rev. H. M., New York, N. Y.	25.00	Waterbury, Rev. A. Rensselaerville, N. Y.	10.00
Sanders, Mrs. H. M., New York, N. Y.	25.00	Wattles, Jno. D., Philadelphia, Pa.	15.00
Smith, Miss C. K., Monmouth, Ill.	10.00	Washburn, W. W., Morgan Park, Ill.	40.00
Snow, Rev. F. A., Newton Centre, Mass.	1.00	Waugh, Rev. A. J., Willoughby, O.	3.00
Stearns, Prof. O. S., Newton C'tre, Mass.	10.00	Wellington, Mrs. Sarah, Warwick, N. Y.	10.00
Stevens, Bishop Wm. B., Phila., Pa.	205.00	Wheeler, Andrew, Philadelphia, Pa.	25.00
		Whitaker, Rev. R., Newton Centre, Mass.	2.00
Talmage, Rev. D. M., Mont Moor, N. Y.	5.00	White, E. M., Boston, Mass.	100.00
Thomas, Rev. J. H., Lawrenceburg, Ind.	4.00	White, Jno. G., Philadelphia, Pa.	10.00
Thombs, Rev. A. B., Newton C'tre, Mass.	1.00	White, Rev. Jas., New York, N. Y.	20.00
Thresher, E. M., Dayton, O.	40.00	White, Rev. W. W., New Haven, Conn.	1.00
Thresher, J. B., Dayton, O.	80.00	Whiting, Rev. F. C., Groton, Mass.	10.00
		Whiting, I. O., Boston, Mass.	10.00
Ure, Rev. D. M., Monmouth, Ill.	10.00	Willis, O., Ottawa, Kan.	1.00
Van Kirk, Rev. R. W., Newton C'tre, Mas.	1.00	Wilson, Rev. A. M., Fox Lake, Wis.	10.00
		Worcester, Rev. J. H., Chicago, Ill.	10.00

Full amount received, \$4,881.00

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INSTITUTE OF HEBREW.

At the annual meeting of the Institute of Hebrew held December 30, 1886, in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, N. Y., some matters of particular interest were discussed. There is given below an abstract of some of the business transacted.

Profs. Paul Haupt, Ph. D., of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., and Hermann V. Hilprecht, Ph. D., of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., were elected members of the Institute.

The name of the organization was changed from "The Institute of Hebrew" to "The American Institute of Hebrew."

The Treasurer was authorized to close the books for the present year on December 1st, instead of January 1st, in order that sufficient time might be given for reports.

The Principal was authorized to offer free tuition in the northern Summer Schools, Chicago, New England, and Philadelphia, in case he shall be able to secure the sum of \$1,000 in addition to the regular contributions to the endowment fund.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

Executive Committee: Geo. E. Day, D. D., President, New Haven, Conn.; Francis Brown, Ph. D., Vice-President, 1200 Park Ave., New York City, N. Y.; John P. Peters, Ph. D., Secretary, 4408 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.; Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., Treasurer and Principal of Schools, New Haven, Conn.; Charles R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.; D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.; John G. Lansing, D. D., New Brunswick, N. J.

The following Committees on the special work were appointed:

For the Philadelphia School,—Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn., Jno. P. Peters, Ph. D., Philadelphia, Pa., F. A. Gast, Lancaster, Pa., John G. Lansing, D. D., New Brunswick, New Jersey, Wm. H. Green, D. D., Princeton, New Jersey, B. C. Taylor, M. A., Chester, Pa., W. W. Lovejoy, Philadelphia, Pa.

For the Chicago School,—Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn., E. L. Curtis, Ph. D., Chicago, Ill., M. S. Terry, D. D., Evanston, Ill., Samuel Ives Curtiss, D. D., Chicago, Ill., Wm. G. Ballantine, D. D., Oberlin, Ohio, H. P. Smith, D. D., Cincinnati, Ohio, R. D. Wilson, Ph. D., Allegheny, Pa.

For the New England School.—Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn., C. R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass., D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass., H. G. Mitchell, Ph. D., Boston, Mass., F. B. Denio, M. A., Bangor, Me., E. C. Bissell, D. D., Hartford, Conn., J. P. Taylor, Ph. D., Andover, Mass.

For the Southern School.—Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn., W. W. Moore, D. D., Hampden Sidney, Va., Basil Manly, D. D., Louisville, Ky., J. Packard, D. D., Alexandria, Va., J. R. Sampey, Louisville, Ky., R. V. Foster, D. D., Lebanon, Tenn.

For the Correspondence School.—Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn., Geo. E. Day, D. D., New Haven, Conn., C. R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.

It was voted to change the name "Fellow of the Institute of Hebrew" to "Associate Member of the Institute of Hebrew." Examinations will be held therefore for Associate Memberships instead of for Fellowships. It was also decided that the examination of candidates for Associate Memberships should be both oral and written. The oral examinations to be conducted at the Summer Schools by the Instructors of the Schools. The written examinations to be conducted by the Principal, and the papers to be transmitted by him to the Executive Committee.

The Secretary reported that in accordance with the vote of the Institute instructing him "to correspond with the faculties of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada, urging the importance of introducing Hebrew among the courses of study," he prepared a circular, and shortly before the period of annual commencements and trustee meetings caused this letter, together with an article reprinted from THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT for that purpose, to be sent to the presidents of 250 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. This led, in several cases, to further correspondence, and in October the Secretary prepared and sent to fifty colleges and universities in the United States cards of inquiry, to ascertain to what extent instruction in Hebrew is actually offered in our leading institutions. Allegheny, Amherst, Columbia, Dickinson, Harvard, Kenyon, North-Western University, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan University, University of the City of New York, Olivet, Randolph, Macon, Syracuse University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, William Jewell and Yale reported an elective in Hebrew. The following reported its introduction this year, in some cases in answer to the circular sent out:—Columbia, Kenyon, Oberlin, University of the City of New York, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale. Washington and Jefferson offer Hebrew in some years, but not in all. The following reported Hebrew as an optional or extra study for from twenty to forty exercises in all:—Emory, Rutgers, St. Stephens, Simpson, and Trinity. Dartmouth and Wison made no reply; but in 1883 both reported such an optional. Princeton has taken steps toward the establishment in the college department of a chair in Semitic languages, and the introduction of a Hebrew elective. Beloit, Franklin, and Marshall, University of Michigan, University of the South, University of Tennessee, University of Wooster and Williams reported themselves as looking in the same direction. Johns Hopkins reported the probable extension of Hebrew downward to the underground course. Only Cornell reported retrogression, having ceased to give instruction in any Semitic language.

The following resolutions were adopted by the Institute:

Whereas, largely owing to the work of this Institute, Hebrew has been introduced into the curriculum of not a few of our principal colleges and universities: and,

Whereas, to students unable to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by such colleges and universities, this Institute affords through its Correspondence and Summer Schools, opportunities to acquire the rudiments of the Hebrew language; therefore,

RESOLVED: that in the opinion of the Institute it is desirable that theological schools should earnestly recommend to all who have theological study in view, that they master the elements of Hebrew, either in college or in the schools of the Institute, before entering the seminary or divinity school;

RESOLVED: that in the opinion of the Institute it is desirable that theological schools should endeavor to provide for the proper instruction of students who come already grounded in Hebrew.

The substance of the special reports of the committees of the several Schools is contained in the Principal's Report. Action was taken looking to greater uniformity in these reports, and to a clearer presentation of the details of the work.

It was the general feeling of those present at the meeting, that a great advance had been made already, and that the results of the work were even more than could have been expected at so early a date. It was believed that the friends of Hebrew and Old Testament study have reason to be encouraged because of the bright outlook which seems to exist for such studies.

▷BOOK ❖ NOTICES.◁

KUENEN'S HEXATEUCH.*

Prof. Kuenen stands second only to Wellhausen, as an authoritative representative of the views of the most advanced school of Old Testament critics. The present volume is but the first of a series in which the author will apply the same critical methods to the entire Old Testament.

In an introduction of thirty pages we are given "An Outline of the History of Criticism of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua during the last quarter of a century." Twenty-five years ago the *dominant theory* was as follows:

"The Deuteronomist, a contemporary of Manasseh or Josiah, was the redactor of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, and it was he who brought them into the form in which they now lie before us. He interwove or inserted his own laws and narratives into the work of the Yahwist (Jehovist) that dated from the eighth century B. C., and was therefore about a hundred years old in his time. To this Yahwist we owe the first four books of the Pentateuch and the earlier (præ-deuteronomic) recension of Joshua. His work was in its turn based upon a still earlier composition—the 'Grundschrift' or 'Book of Origins'—which came from the pen of a priest or Levite and might be referred to the century of Solomon. Embedded in this 'Grundschrift' were still more ancient fragments, some of them Mosaic. The Yahwist expanded and supplemented the 'Grundschrift' with materials drawn in part from tradition and in part from written sources."

The first departure from the theory was the rejection of the "Ergänzungshypothese;" a second departure was the distinguishing of successive elements in the so-called "Grundschrift;" a third was the assignment of the final shaping of the priestly passages to a time subsequent to that of Deuteronomy; and a fourth was the giving up of the idea that the Deuteronomist was the redactor of our present Hexateuch. The Introduction contains brief criticisms of the works of Colenso,† Popper,‡ Graf,§ Koster,|| Nöldeke,** Kayser,†† Duham,‡‡ Wellhausen.¶¶

In his work, the author takes the following order: (1) The general character

* AN HISTORICO-CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN AND COMPOSITION OF THE HEXATEUCH (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua). By A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at Leiden; translated from the Dutch, with the assistance of the author by Philip H. Wicksted, M. A. London: Macmillan & Co. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. Pp. 344. Price, \$4.00.

† Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, 1862.

‡ Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte, 1862.

§ Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 1866.

|| De Historie-beschouwing van den Deuteronomist met de berichten in Genesis-Numeri vergeleken, 1868.

** Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. Testaments, 1869.

†† Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen, 1874.

‡‡ Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion, 1875.

¶¶ Prolegomena to the History of Israel, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1885.

of the legislation of the Hexateuch; (2) the general character of the narratives of the Hexateuch; (3) the collections of laws and the designations of the Deity, as points of departure in the resolution of the Hexateuch into its component parts; (4) the "priestly" elements; (5) the "Deuteronomic" elements; (6) the "prophetic" elements; (7) chronological order of these elements; (8) the relation of the Hexateuch to other portions of the Old Testament; (9) origin and antiquity of these several elements; (10) the redaction of the Hexateuch.

To take up the details of this presentation would be manifestly impossible. The general view may be thus presented: With the prophets began literary activity among the Israelites; the prophetic literature stands first. Next comes the priestly literature, and last of all the Psalms and wisdom-literature. The sacred legislation and literature arose, as did those of all other nations, by development and not by any supernatural oversight. The question at once suggests itself: In what shape do we have left the Old Testament? The adoption of these views demands the following concessions: (1) That the Old Testament contains nothing of a supernatural element; (2) that it contains nothing of a predictive element; (3) that it contains the record of no miracles; (4) that the early chapters of Genesis, the Book of Judges and similar matter, are mythical; (5) that the Israelites either knew nothing of the origin of their sacred writings, or having a true knowledge, substituted an artificial and forged statement and representation for the true one.

It is conceivable that certain aspects of the view presented will, from the beginning, commend themselves to many minds. Those whose faith has been greatly troubled with some of the historical and moral difficulties of the Old Testament will welcome gladly an hypothesis which renders belief in the reality of these things unnecessary. But what will such do with the testimony furnished in the New Testament in reference to the truth and actual verity of these same things? Similar methods of criticism must be applied here also, and the same elements eliminated likewise from the New Testament. The end of all will be—*no Bible*.

On the other hand, it is unquestionably true that in some features existing views are incorrect. They must be modified; the work of such men as Kuenen will help to do this. But let us be slow to relinquish old views for new, until the latter are thoroughly established.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Einleitung in die heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments.* Von F. Kaulen. Freiburg i/Br.: Herder. 1886. 2. Hälfte. 2. Abth. M.3.
- Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher d. Alten Testaments.* Von W. Schenz. Regensburg: Coppenrath. 1887. 8vo, pp. xv, 480. M.6.
- La science des religions et l'Islamisme, deux conférences, etc.* Paris: E. Leroux. Pp. 95. 2fr.50
- Le Talmud de Jerusalem traduit pour la première fois.* Par M. Schwab. T. IX. Paris: Maisonneuve et Leclerc. Pp. iv, 300. 10fr.
- The People's Bible.* Vol. IV. Num. xxvii.—Deut. By Joseph Parker. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. \$1.50

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- The Wonderful Tent.* By Dr. Randall, in Presbyterian Observer.
- Die Geschichte des Cherubs.* By J. A. M. Mensinga in Ztschr. f. wissenschaftliche Theol., Band xxx. Heft I.
- Die Schlacht bei Issos im Alten Testament* (Ps. lxxviii.). By A. Hilgenfeld, ib.
- Ueber die Hypothese Steinthal's, dass Simson ein Sonnenheros sei.* By Dr. Flöckner in Theol. Quartalschrift. '87. Heft I.
- Jesaja III. 16—IV. 6.* By Dr. H. Oort in Theol. Tijdschrift. xx. Nov., '86.
- Canon Westcott.* By W. H. Simcox in Expositor, Jan., '87.
- Randolph's "Analytical Notes on the first and three last of the Minor Prophets, for the use of Hebrew students."* By A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib.

- The Prophetess Deborah.* By S. R. Driver, ib.
- q'énāh ûr'énāh: Go ye and See.* A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis: translated from the Judæo-Polish, with Notes and Indices; by Paul Isaac Hershon. With Introductory Notes by the Venerable Archdeacon F. W. Farrar. By A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib.
- W. Lindsay Alexander's "Zeechariah: his Visions and Warnings."* By A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib.
- Briggs' "Messianic Prophecy."* By T. K. Cheyne, ib.
- The meaning of the Hebrew word kipod.* By John Davies in Academy, Dec. 25, '86.
- Philology Notes.* Ib.
- Explorations in Palestine.* Athenæum, Dec. 25, '86.
- The Study of Hebrew and Liberal Culture.* By J. F. McCurdy in Toronto Mail, Dec. 25, '86.
- Harper's "Elements of Hebrew (7th ed.)," and "Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual."* Jewish Messenger, Jan. 7, '87.
- Pictures of Jerusalem, the Holy City. XIV. The Mount of Olives.* By S. J. M. Eaton in Presbyterian Banner, Jan. 12, '87.
- The Covenant.* American Israelite, Jan. 14, '87.
- The Biblical Record Corroborated.* By John F. Hurst in Canadian Baptist, Jan. 13, '87.
- Facilities for Studying Hebrew.* By W. H. Woolery in Christian Standard, Jan. 15, '87.
- Oriental Traditions of the Deluge.* By Otto Zöckler in S. S. Times, Jan. 8, '87.
- Gen. VI. 9-22.* By Profs. Green, Driver and Franz Delitzsch, ib.
- Biblical Criticism and Biblical Critics.* Ib., Jan. 15, '87.
- Indications of Race-origins.* By A. H. Sayce, ib.
- Gen. XII. 1-9.* By Profs. Green and Franz Delitzsch, ib.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

MARCH, 1887.

No. 7.

IT is a common thing, in these days, to hear mention of the remarkable interest everywhere manifested in the study of the Bible. To many, doubtless, the reiterated statement of this fact grows wearisome ; but there are others, by whom both fact and statement are received with strong and hearty welcome.

The foe of the Bible as well as its friend must acknowledge the supremacy which it has gained. If actions speak, if events of ordinary life have meaning, no fact is more certain than that the position held by the Bible *to-day*, is one of greater promise and of wider influence than that in any preceding period of its existence. At no other time have the minds of so many different men, of so many different classes of men, been directed toward it. Do we ask evidence of this interest ? Read the accounts of Palestine-exploration, of Egyptian and Babylonian excavation and research. Read merely the titles of works relating to Bible-topics which almost daily leave the press. Number the journals and reviews which are mainly or exclusively devoted to the discussion of Bible-themes ; the schools which have been founded to propagate Bible-study ; the men who are devoting their whole lives to Bible-investigation.

It is true that, in some of this work, interest in the Bible is only secondary ; in some of it the guiding motive is a hostile one. Nevertheless it is work on the Bible, it is study of the Bible ; and an interest in the Bible, even if characterized by hostility, is preferable to indifference toward it, or neglect of it. We speak of a revival of interest in the study of the Bible. Are we in the midst of it ? We are rather on the *cve* of it. For the present is as night in the brilliancy of that day, not far distant, when the Bible shall be more widely known and its authority more widely recognized.

IT is now five years since college-students, as such, first undertook to do something in the way of organized Bible-study. It seems

strange that an effort of this kind was not made earlier. It is certainly gratifying that the progress during these few years has been so great.

The study of the Bible by college-students would seem to be the most natural thing in the world. It is an *education* that they seek. Will any book, or score of books, do more to educate a man? The study of the Bible by college-students would seem to be a thing most needed. Is there any book of whose contents, upon graduation, they are more ignorant?

The study of the Bible by college-students would seem to be of all things the most desirable. Is there any period in life when a better opportunity for Bible-study will be afforded? or when that moral guidance, which the Bible alone can furnish, will be more acceptable?

YET, in seeming opposition to all this, a serious danger is thought to attend the Bible-study of a student in college. Nearly every man, during his life-time, passes through a stage of scepticism of a character more or less pronounced. It may be before, it may be after his conversion. It is most likely to come between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four. This is the college-age. There is believed to be danger, therefore, that in the careful and critical study which, of course, as a student he will do, questions may be asked which he cannot answer; authorities may be consulted which are not safe; doubts may be aroused which cannot be settled. Taught by his college-discipline to accept only that which is demonstrated to be true, he may be led to reject much as unproven which a maturer judgment would receive. Because certain presentations of Bible-truths, which have been in his mind since childhood, are shown by investigation to be false, he may be led to doubt the reality of all presentations and, indeed, of all Bible-truth. But must the man be kept in ignorance of scientific truth, lest, perhaps, knowing it, he may be injured thereby? It might, it is to be confessed, be easy, with certain views, to work havoc among a band of Christian college-men. On the other hand, honest, conscientious, careful study will injure no man. The eye must be opened sooner or later. The sooner it is opened the better. With proper precautions, no season is more opportune than during college-life.

THERE is another danger which attends the Bible-study of a college-student. Too much of the Bible-work of our day is superficial, going no deeper than the surface. By a large class of interpreters the

Bible is treated as indeed they would not think of treating any other book. It is a sort of "catch all," and its study a "catch-me-who-catch-can." Anything means everything, and everything means anything. No hypothesis is too absurd, no twisting of thought too violent, if it will but suit the case in hand. All this is justified upon the ground that thereby the spiritual meaning is ascertained. Is it strange that when such ideas prevail a student, accustomed to scholarly work, should become disgusted and abandon the study? The truth is, however, that these dangers are connected not with Bible-study itself, but rather with erroneous and perverted methods of study.

ONE question more. Why should not the study of the Bible have a place in the college-curriculum? If it is a study of such importance, one of such influence on men's thoughts and actions; if it is a study for college-students, and yet one in prosecution of which great care and judgment are requisite, why should it not be included among other studies, at least as an elective? It is not sufficient to say that such work belongs to the Sunday-school; for, as a rule, college-men do not attend Sunday-school; and further, the kind of work desired is not done in Sunday-school. It is not sufficient to say that such work shall be restricted to the family; for here again it is impossible to obtain the help needed. There must be offered an opportunity for young men to do scholarly and scientific Bible-work. The college alone can make this provision; nor will a long time elapse before such provision is made, and an elective for the study of biblical literature offered. At present, however, we must meet the question in a different form, viz., "the study of the Bible by college-students;" and to this topic as treated in the article following, attention is invited.

THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE BY COLLEGE-STUDENTS.*

BY THE EDITOR.

We have before us two facts: (1) The college does not provide for instruction in the Bible. For reasons which at present seem sufficient, this department of work, great and growing as it is, finds no place in the curriculum of study. The study of the Bible, if it is to be studied at all by those in attendance upon college, must be an *outside* work. (2) A fair proportion of the students in all our colleges are professing Christians; and this proportion is increasing. Of those who profess to be Christians, a number,—it is a matter for regret that the number is not larger,—have shown in various ways, and especially by their connection with the College Y. M. C. A. work, that they desire to grow in a knowledge of the Scriptures. It is not the purpose of all these men to become ministers; and those whose purpose it is do not choose to postpone such work as Bible-study until they are prepared to enter the theological seminary, where real Bible-study is perhaps almost as much neglected as in college. These are men from whom every profession and almost every branch of business will gain recruits. They are, moreover, men who in time will rank highest in the business or the profession which they shall choose. Upon them will be laid great social, political and financial responsibilities. They cannot look forward to a future time for an opportunity to prosecute such study without interruption. It is a present and a pressing duty.

These are the facts; and the question we are to consider is, The study of the Bible by these men, outside of regular college-work, yet during the college-course. Let us look at the question from four points of view:—

1. *How much can be done?* On account of his regular duties the student cannot, in the very nature of the case, *give much time* to this work; but in view of the mental discipline gained in the performance of these duties, and the habits of study which characterize his college-life, he should expect to accomplish large results.

It is frequently asked why ministers, who make it their profession to study and to teach the Bible, do not accomplish more in this their professional line. And ministers themselves, many of them, confess that they do not do "what is expected of them, what ought to be expected of them, and what they ought to expect of themselves." There may be many reasons; but the chief one is this: They have lost their habits of study. They do not remain students. The exceptions, to be sure, are many; but in far too large a majority of cases, regular, systematic, rigid study has been dropped, and, consequently, vigor of mind has gradually been lost. How many ministers at the age of fifty, an age at which they should be able to do the best work of their lives, are dead intellectually!

With the college-student, on the other hand, it is different; nor is it a matter of choice. He is compelled to study. His mind is, of necessity, active. Much

* Read before the conference of the New England College Y. M. C. A., February 19.

can be done in a time comparatively short. At no later period in his life, will acquisition be so easy. His memory is at its best; his judgment, though not yet in all respects matured, is generally reliable. Everything considered, he is in the best possible condition for intellectual work—is it necessary to say that the study of the Bible is intellectual work?—and the time given to the study under consideration, though short, should be made to count.

But farther; the amount accomplished will vary largely with the kind of work attempted, the spirit with which the work is done, the method employed, and the guidance under which it is performed. In some lines of biblical study, and these generally are the most important, progress is slow. With a lukewarm spirit, little can be expected. By some methods one moves, perhaps; but the movement is backward and not forward. There are guides, who in the end prove to be false guides; leaders who turn out to be *mis*-leaders. Yet, under ordinary circumstances, and in spite of difficulties of all kinds, much should be accomplished; and if much is not accomplished, it may at once be surmised that something somewhere is wrong. Given men of average ability, with average methods, with fair spirit, with correct guidance, and even with limited time at their disposal, there should be, and there will be, *results*.

Another item, at this point, deserves consideration. Students enter college with some knowledge of the Scriptures. It is difficult for men, in this age, to read even the secular papers without gaining some ideas concerning the Bible. Many men have had some Bible-training when children, a training which, if well performed, continues to have its influence throughout life.

It is, on the other hand, also true that, among those graduating from our highest institutions, men are to be found whose ignorance of the Bible, its facts and its methods, is indeed lamentable. College-graduates have entered the divinity school who could only with greatest difficulty give information as to whether Abraham lived before Moses, or Moses before Abraham; who could not indicate within five hundred years the date of King David; who had heard of a Saul, and a Paul, but in some way had confounded the two names. *These are facts*. But such ignorance is exceptional. The average man enters Freshman with some basis on which to build. His knowledge is hazy; it must be made clear and definite. His ideas of the Bible are, perhaps, very crude; they must be matured and embellished. The Bible, to him, is an incomprehensible medley of story and law; it must be analyzed, and the relations of these elements to each other pointed out. It abounds in what appear to him to be inexplicable difficulties; he must learn those great underlying principles, a knowledge of which will enable him to see the superficial, insignificant character of these difficulties. It is, for him, a book to be handled carefully, and that, on but one day in seven; he must learn to treat it as an *every-day* book, and to handle it more often than any other book. Or, perhaps it is a lofty, unapproachable thing, to be regarded from without with superstitious awe, a thing to be worshiped,—in short, a fetish; he must learn that it is not only divine, but *human*; not only given by God, but written by men, and for men. Is it not a great mistake of our day, especially among the most consecrated Christian workers, to ignore the human element in Scripture? All this, and much more, ought to be and can be accomplished during a college-course.

2. *What kind of work shall be done?* It is the chief object of all kinds of Christian work to convey gospel truth to those who are out of Christ. That work which does not bear, directly or indirectly, upon this end may be considered

nseless. It is the great aim of the Bible-student, so to study the Bible, so to master its contents, as to make it of the greatest possible value to himself, and himself the most efficient worker possible in advancing the cause of divine truth in the world.

In working out this purpose, it is necessary first of all that a student or Christian worker shall have a spiritual grasp of the Scriptures; he must have that familiarity with certain portions, that personal experience of certain truths, which will enable him to make practical use of the same in the hand-to-hand work of the street or the inquiry-room. A man's strength in Christian work is measured largely by his ability to make this use of Scripture truth. This kind of work is, of all kinds, the most practical and the most essential. It is a work for which, in preparation, years of study and prayer and, often, many seasons of affliction are needed. It is not to be obtained at once. It does not come with the memorizing of verses here and there; or with the repetition of a few selected exhortatory sentences. It is the highest of all possessions; the deepest of all knowledge. It will come in time to the child of God, but to him only, and only in time. The training-classes of the College Y. M. C. A. have done and are doing a great work in this line. The fruit of it is apparent to all. We can only pray that the work may continue, and the results be still greater.

But is there not among some, and particularly among those who have done this work and profited by it most, a feeling that it is not *all* that is wanted, that something additional is needed? Are men that have been trained to do the most thorough work, as college-men have been trained, satisfied with a kind of Bible-work which, although from one point of view the deepest, is from another superficial? There is no contradiction here. What in one sense is deep may in another sense be of the surface. It is, or aims to be, deep spiritually; while intellectually it is confessedly and necessarily too often superficial.

For the uneducated man, the undisciplined mind, this is sufficient. It is, indeed, the only kind of work he is capable of doing. A man who has never been taught to think or to do close reasoning must stop here. But it is otherwise with the college-student. His mind is awake to every difficulty. If he is a student, questions will continually present themselves which he must have answered. Questionings begin, and they will most certainly lead to doubt and scepticism, if they are not met, if the principles which explain them are not set forth. That man is not a student who does not ask: "Why is this? When was that?" If one accustomed to ask these questions, and to have them answered, in reference to subjects outside the Bible, does not ask them in reference to the Bible, one of two things must be true: His interest in the Bible, like the seed sown on stony ground, will be short-lived, for it has not taken root; or, his conception of the Bible is so shallow, so imperfect, so erroneous, as to render his Christian life and ministrations of no permanent value. The student, it may be repeated, if he be a student, will think; he will inquire; he will investigate; he will know all that is to be known, so far as his circumstances will allow the acquisition of this knowledge.

And so we appeal for a kind of Bible-study on the part of college-men which, in some respects, will be different from that which hitherto has generally been in vogue. We do not make this appeal with any desire to see the other kind of study slighted. It is needed and must continue; but it is not all that is needed.

The appeal is made with the belief, and indeed the knowledge, that college

men have themselves felt the necessity of this thing. Of the man who receives the advantages of an education much more is expected than of him who is denied this privilege. It is but fair, then, to expect college-men, while in college, to form habits of study, to gain methods of work in the realm of the Bible which shall, in time, fit them for the highest and best kind of biblical study. If the college-student is not to do this, of whom, pray, is it to be expected? This work, intended, we repeat, not to supersede, but to supplement and strengthen that now being done, may, for want of a better term, be called intellectual work. The term critical would be more appropriate, but it is liable to be misunderstood. Its detailed description must be brief.

1. It would be an *historical* work, including a mastery, so far as possible, of the details of Bible-history; a putting together of this and that event; an investigation of the great epochs; a study of the great characters; an inquiry into the causes of things as they are represented in Scripture and in their relations to each other.

2. It would be a *literary* work, including the study of the literary form of the various books; the question of their authorship and date; the circumstances under which they had their origin; the purpose they were intended to subserve; the people for whom they were originally written; their history.

3. It would be a work of *interpretation*, including an application of those great principles common to the interpretation of all writings; and, in addition, the study of those special principles demanded by the unique character of the Bible; a going down beneath the surface, a searching after things deep and hidden; an investigation of prophecy; a study of the divine plan for the redemption of man, as it began, and developed, and was finally accomplished in the life, work and death of the Christ.

It is for work of this kind,—critical, to be sure, yet necessary to a conservation of the truth; intellectual, yet forming the basis of the deepest spiritual work.—that we appeal.

3. *With what spirit shall this work be done?* If, now, such work as this should commend itself, and should be undertaken, it may not be out of place to consider the spirit with which it should be performed; for this is vital. A bad work, with bad methods, but with good spirit, often succeeds. A work, good or bad, with bad methods, but good spirit, generally succeeds. While a good work, with good methods, but with the wrong spirit, generally fails. The first thing is to satisfy ourselves that the work proposed is a good work. Next in importance is the spirit. Last of all comes the method.

1. The spirit must be a *reverent* one. In this day of flippant and often blasphemous criticism, reverence is a thing to be cultivated. Perhaps, it is thought, this caution is not needed. Of those who have sufficient interest in the Bible to study it, a reverential spirit would be expected. But it must be confessed that, in the kind of work which has been referred to, there is a danger of losing, to some extent, that reverence for the Sacred Volume which the other kind of study increases. In the critical handling of the book a liberty is taken, a familiarity is gained, that seems, in the case of some, to destroy the feeling of respect and awe, which, from one point of view, ought to characterize the student's attitude toward the Holy Book. Now, so far as this study destroys that Bible-worship of which so many Christians are unconsciously guilty, it is well. There are those who treat the Bible as they would treat an idol. It is

regarded by them with a superstitious, sanctimonious feeling, as a kind of charm. This is a use for which the Sacred Book was never intended; and one great result to be accomplished by the kind of work here advocated is the removal of this unfounded and mischievous idea. True reverence for divine truth, and proper regard for the instrument through which that truth has been revealed are quite a different thing. These must be cultivated.

2. The spirit must be the *historical* spirit. Before college-men this point scarcely needs expansion. It is the truth we seek; and this truth, when found, we should be ready to accept at whatever cost. It is a sore trial to have ideas with which we have been familiar from our infancy shown to be erroneous. It is most difficult to put aside the prejudices which years have hardened. Yet the former will take place, and the latter must take place, if the historical spirit is to have sway. This historical spirit is one of slow acquisition. To do what it requires seems, at first, like parting with one's dearest treasures. It cannot be acquired without a struggle. But of all men, college-men should be the foremost in seeking it, the most careful in its application, and its staunchest defenders when it is assailed.

3. The spirit must be an *independent* one. "That student makes no *real* progress who is satisfied with having learned what some one else has said concerning the meaning of a verse, or the scope of a passage; who always *follows*, who is always *leaning upon* another. Such a student crams; he does not digest. His work is done for the moment; not for all time. He examines only results; never the processes leading to the results. The fact is, he does not do *honest* work. And yet all the world knows that the knowledge which does not come by honest work does not stay; it may indeed be said never to have come. This explains the multitude of failures under the present Sunday-school system, admirable as it is. Many students, strangely enough, suppose that they need only read the 'notes' published in any sheet, or perhaps only the 'practical lessons' suggested, and they will in time come to know the Bible. Partly because these 'notes' are, in so many cases, the merest *trash*, and partly because even when most excellent they are not properly studied, the Bible-student who feels that the preparation of his Sunday-school lesson is all the Bible-study which he need undertake, who is satisfied to study the lesson as he would be ashamed to study a college-lesson, in too many cases,—makes an out-and-out failure."* Crutches are freely furnished us in these days,—so freely, indeed, that too many of us have forgotten how to stand on our feet. The spirit of independent investigation, a habit for the development of which the entire college-system is intended, must be cultivated. The world needs independent thinkers, men who have the ability to determine *for themselves* whether a certain thing is, or is not: and these men must come largely from the ranks of college-men.

There are other characteristics of the spirit which should attend this work, but space forbids any enlargement of this point.

4. By what *method* shall this work be done? Having considered the amount of work, the kind of work, and the spirit of the work, it only remains for us briefly to take up the method of the work. No two men will do the same thing best, in the same way. Each man must work largely by his own method. A method helpful to one man, or set of men, might be ruinous to another man, or set of

* February (1886) STUDENT, p. 274.

men. Independence not only of spirit, but as well of method,—of any and every method,—is a thing to be sought after. A constant effort should be made to keep out of the ruts. Yet, after all, there must be a plan of work. He who works without plan and aimlessly will find his results without form and void—chaotic. A poor method is better than no method; but in making a selection it is wise to choose the best.

1. First, the method should be one consistent with methods employed by the student in similar college-work. If the method employed is essentially different, it must mean either that the college-methods are wrong, or that the subject handled is of such a nature as to *demand* a different method. Neither of these suppositions can be maintained. College-methods are the embodiment of centuries of experience and wisdom, and are, in general, correct. The Bible is a book to be studied as other books. Each writer has peculiarities of style, of diction, which need to be understood. Isaiah's usage of words, syntax and style, is to be taken up in precisely the same manner as one would deal with Homer, or Horace. His exact meaning is as dependent upon a knowledge of his times and circumstances as is that of any classical writer on his times and his circumstances. There are, it is true, some special principles to which reference has in part been made, viz., the element of the supernatural, of miracle, of prophecy. But so far as it goes, the method adopted in the study of Homer or Horace is the method to be adopted in the study of Isaiah or Paul.

2. Our method must be one which will be disciplinary in its influence; it must be one which will train the mind and keep it trained. For, if it does not help, it will injure the mind. Good habits of study, if already acquired, should be strengthened by it. Bad habits should be corrected. How many men expend the same amount of mental energy in the preparation of a Bible-lesson as in preparation for a college-recitation? In the latter, it is work; in the former, too often, at the best half-work. This is all wrong. Our method of work should be one which will demand the same rigid, unflinching effort required by college-tasks, the only difference being that in the former case the effort is to be a voluntary one, while in the latter it is compulsory.

3. It must be a method which will lead to *definite results*. When one has finished a course of study in any department, he will surely be disappointed and dissatisfied with the subject, his teacher and himself, if he is not able to put his hands on certain definite results. Now, the Bible is a small book. It consists of a definite number of separate books, each of which has its place in the canon for a certain purpose. It is, we all believe, an inexhaustible book; and yet the work of mastering this book is, in one sense, a very definite one. With a plan of study looking towards thorough work and definite results, the facts, the purpose, the teachings of book after book will come into our possession; one principle after another will become familiar; one period of history after another will gradually develop itself before us. But to accomplish this, the method must itself be definite and indicate definite work.

4. It must be a *logical* method. If it teach a list of events without also teaching the relation of these events to each other, it will not answer. If it take a verse here and a passage there, without considering that verse in the light of its context, it will not answer. If it attempt to exhaust the meaning of a verse, without first a study of the chapter of which the verse is a part; or of a chapter, without first a study of the book of which the chapter is a part, it will not answer. There must

be consecution, connection, logical order. A method which lacks this characteristic will scarcely satisfy men whose whole lives have been given to work of this character.

5. Finally, the method must be as comprehensive as possible. Mastery of details is needed, yet also mastery of the subject as a whole. "It is a mistake to suppose, for a moment, that Bible-study consists in the *study of isolated texts*; or in the study of single chapters; or even in the study of entire books. A man might study *verses* all his life and know comparatively little of the Bible. Besides, the man who studies only *verses* does one-sided, imperfect, narrow work. As has been said, he who does not have in mind the entire book, and from this standpoint do his work, does not and cannot appreciate the full force of a single verse contained in that book. The same thing holds good in a higher sphere. It is not sufficient merely to have gained a comprehensive knowledge of a given book. Although we may know the contents, the analysis, the occasion, purpose, author, etc., etc., of this book, there is still something to be ascertained. What? The place of that book in the Bible as a whole; its relation to other books; the relation of its contents to the contents of the entire Bible, to the entire plan of God for the salvation of man. How comparatively contemptible, after all, is the study of mere verses! How much he loses who satisfies himself that, having done this, he has done all! We should be close, critical, accurate students of a *verse*; we should be searching, analytical, systematizing students of a *book*; we should also be broad, comprehensive, general students of the Bible."* Let our method, therefore, whatever else it is, be a comprehensive one.

The time has come for a more careful consideration of the question of Bible-study by college-students than it has ever yet received. In all its varied work, the College Y. M. C. A. has no department so important. Our age calls for broader and deeper work in this line; and the responsibility for this work rests largely upon college-men.

An attempt has been made to embody the points here presented in an "outline study." This "study" may serve in a feeble way to illustrate what we think might with profit be done with every book of the Bible. It will serve also, though perhaps in a still more feeble way, to show the kind of work which, from the stand-point here taken, college-students ought to do. In this outline† no place is given to the practical and spiritual work for which the Book of Exodus, the book chosen, is so admirably suited. The insertion of this element did not come within the scope of the task here undertaken. Such work, however, is not to be omitted; and it would seem quite certain that, as a result of work something like that which is here proposed, the practical and spiritual elements would be much more easily found and much more wisely employed.

* May ('86) STUDENT, p. 377.

† See pages 203-208 of this number.

A BOOK-STUDY: EXODUS.

BY THE EDITOR.

I. GENERAL REMARKS.

1. This *study*, like its predecessors, does not furnish material; but directions for obtaining material. It is not intended for specialists; but for those who need help in their Bible-study and recognize their need.

2. The aim of the work which it prescribes is three-fold: (1) The acquisition of *real* Bible-knowledge; (2) the cultivation of a historical spirit; (3) the attainment of a habit of independent investigation.

3. It is not supposed that even all the important matters relating to the Book of Exodus are here touched upon; nor, on the other hand, is it expected that every man who undertakes the "study" shall do all that is indicated. Men's tastes differ. Some have special liking for geography, or chronology. To others, topics in these lines are distasteful. For exhaustive work, all that is here laid out, and much more, should be performed; yet by those who are so disposed, some points may be gone over rapidly; some, indeed, may be omitted entirely.

4. That which is most needed in Bible-work is, not reading, but thinking. Upon a book which introduces so great a number of distinct topics, a large amount of reading is impossible. With but a limited amount of time for one's work, reading *Exodus* will be found more helpful than reading *about* Exodus. Still, a commentary, if a good one, will be found most helpful. For the English reader the "Pulpit"¹ commentary, or Lange's,² is the best. No better guide will be found to the works on Exodus, than the article of Francis Brown, D. D., in the November *STUDENT*, describing the principal commentaries which have been written on this book.

II. ORDER OF INDIVIDUAL WORK.

1. Read the *entire* book through at one sitting; this will take about two hours. It is necessary first to gain a general idea of the book to be studied. Then details may be introduced and assigned their proper place.

2. Read at separate sittings (1) chapters I.-XII.; (2) chapters XIII.-XVIII.; (3) chapters XIX.-XXIV.; (4) chapters XXV.-XXXI.; (5) chapters XXXII.-XL. In these readings, observe closely the subject and general thought of each chapter; note particularly the connection of each chapter with that which precedes it and that which follows it.³

3. Take up the book a *third* time, and write on separate slips of paper the topic or topics of which each chapter treats;⁴ study these topics until without

¹ Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.

² Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

³ Make use of no commentary. Read thoughtfully; and when a word, or phrase, or verse, occurs, the meaning of which is not clear, indicate the fact by an interrogation point. In a later reading, many of these doubtful points will become clear. As opportunity offers, or as the particular point under consideration demands, satisfy yourself as to these difficulties by the aid of commentaries.—*March* ['86] *STUDENT*.

⁴ These chapter-divisions are followed only for the sake of convenience in making references. Frequently the first verse or two of a chapter must be counted as belonging to the preceding.

hesitation the details under each can be recalled; study also to recall in connection with the number of each chapter the topics and contents of that chapter.¹

4. Analyze the book :²

- a) Decide upon a general subject or heading for the entire book, and then divide the book into two or more divisions, for each of which there will be a distinct heading.
- b) Under each general division, mark out at least two or three subdivisions; and then divide these still further into sections.

5. Index the book :

- a) Go through the book and make a list of all important persons, events, and objects referred to : e. g., Pharaoh, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, etc.; Plague, Law, Tabernacle, etc.; and arrange them in alphabetical order.
- b) Connect with each name, in the order narrated in the book, the events or statements relating directly to it.³

6. Study now the chronology of the book :

- a) Compare the Revised version⁴ of Exod. xii. 40 with the translation of the Septuagint and Samaritan of the same text.
- b) Collect the arguments for and against the opinion that the Israelites sojourned in Egypt four hundred and thirty years, considering the force of such passages and texts as Exod. vi. 16-20; Gen. xv. 13-16; Exod. xii. 37; Gal. iii. 17.
- c) Fix the date of the migration of Jacob and his family.
- d) Fix the date of Jacob's death; of Joseph's death.
- e) Fix the date of Moses' birth.
- f) Fix the date of the exodus.
- g) Determine the number of years covered by the book.

7. Consider now certain preliminary topics, a knowledge of which is necessary for an appreciation and comprehension of the condition of things among Egyptians and Israelites at the time of the events narrated in the first chapters of the book :

- a) *The previous history of Israel.*⁵ (1) Sources of this history? (2) Israel's

¹ What the Bible-student desires is Bible-knowledge. The entire Bible is, comparatively, a small volume. Why should one not know, most familiarly, the contents of at least the more important books? What a satisfaction there is in being able, in a moment, as it were, to think through a whole book.—*March* ['86] STUDENT.

² Every student should make his own analysis. Although imperfect, it will be of far more help to him than the most perfect, if prepared by another person. When the analysis has once been made, it should be compared with, and, if necessary, corrected by those which appear in commentaries. It is a sheer waste of time to attempt the memorizing of an analysis prepared by some other person, unless one is gifted with a remarkable verbal memory.—*March* ['86] STUDENT.

³ Considerable judgment must be exercised, in many cases, to determine under what name a given event would best be placed. The same event will often have to be assigned to several names. It ought, however, to be borne in mind that, in the deciding of these questions, and in the writing out of this matter, the student is all the time making himself more familiar with Bible-events, Bible-thoughts and Bible-expression. To really master any thing, one must dwell upon it a long time, and go back to it many times. If variety can be introduced into the study, the work will be all the more interesting; the mastery, all the more rapid.—*April* ['86] STUDENT.

⁴ This represents the Hebrew text. The student is not to be deterred from taking up questions of chronology because they are attended with a greater or less amount of uncertainty. After all, what is there that is not characterized by uncertainty?

⁵ See commentaries on Genesis x., and xii., last chapters of Genesis, and Exodus i. 1-6; article in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. Joseph; Geikie, *Hours with the Bible*, I., chap. XXIV.

origin according to the Book of Genesis? (3) The various ancient Semitic nations and their relation to each other? (4) The divine purpose in selecting one nation through which to bless the whole world? (5) Reasons, from the human stand-point, for the selection of Israel? (6) The number of Jacob's family descending into Egypt? (7) The occasion and circumstances of the descent?

- b) *The previous history of Egypt*:¹ (1) The various dates assigned to the beginning of Egyptian civilization? (2) The great Egyptian monuments, pyramids, etc.? (3) The Egyptian historian Manetho? (4) Chronology and civilization of the "Old Empire" (to B. C. 2100)? (5) Chronology and civilization of the "Middle Empire" (B. C. 2100-1670), the period of the "Shepherd-Kings"? (6) The chronology and civilization of the "New Empire" (B. C. 1670-525)? (7) The eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties? (8) The Pharaoh of Abraham, of Joseph, of the exodus?
- c) *The social and political condition of Egypt*:² (1) Moral character of the people? (2) Intellectual character? (3) Different classes of people? (4) Condition of the peasantry? (5) Form of government? (6) Laws? (7) Relative authority of the priests? (8) Education? (9) Architecture?
- d) *The religion of the Egyptians*:³ (1) Their gods? (2) Monotheism? (3) Their priests? (4) Their belief in an after-life? (5) Their animal-worship?
- e) *The land of Goshen*:⁴ (1) Probable situation? (2) Character of the country? (3) Its present condition? (4) Seasons of the year? (5) Means of subsistence? (6) Principal towns?

8. Consider the important points relating to the history of Israel in Egypt, up to the time of the exodus:⁵

- a) *The oppression*: (1) Duration of peace and independence after Joseph's death? (2) The Pharaoh of the oppression? (3) The tasks to which the Israelites were set? (4) The cities built during this period? (5) Punishments inflicted? (6) Organization and manner of life of Israel during the oppression? (7) Extent to which the customs of Egypt were adopted? (8) Is there any record of divine communication during this period before Moses' time?
- b) *The growth of Israel in Egypt*: (1) Original number of those who descended? (2) The number that came out? (3) The various explanations of the large rate of increase?

¹ See Introduction to commentaries on Exodus, especially *The Pulpit Commentary*, pp. xxlii-xxvii; Fisher's *Outlines of Universal History*, pp. 33-42; Brugsch-Bey, *History of Egypt*, vols. I. and II., especially vol. I., pp. 296-312; vol. II., pp. 91-137; Geikie, *Hours with the Bible*, II., chap. II.; Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, Egypt.

² See articles on Egypt in Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopedias; Brugsch-Bey, *History of Egypt*, vol. I., chap. II.; and other histories of Egypt.

³ See articles on Egypt in Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopedias; and various histories of Egypt; Geikie, vol. II., chap. III.

⁴ See article *Goshen* in Bible Dictionaries; Geikie, vol. II., chap. I.

⁵ These topics are treated of in one form or another in all commentaries; in articles on Israel, Egypt, Moses, The Ten Plagues, Passover and Exodus, in Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopedias and in monographs on the Exodus and Moses; cf. Birks' *Exodus of Israel* (Religious Tract Society, London), Gibson's *The Mosiac Era* (Randolph, N. Y.), Taylor's *Moses, the Lawgiver* (Harper's), Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, vol. II., chaps. III., IV., V., VI.; Geikie's *Old Testament Characters* (Moses).

- c) *Moses*: (1) His birth? (2) His education in Egypt? (3) His preparation in Midian? (4) His call? (5) His return to Egypt? (6) His character and work as gathered from the Book of Exodus? (7) His position as compared with the lawgivers of ancient times?
- d) *The plagues*: (1) The preliminary circumstances? (2) The scene of the plagues, and the Pharaoh who was thus afflicted? (3) The rod turned into a serpent? (4) The jugglers and magicians of the East? (5) The turning of the waters of Egypt into blood,—the significance of this plague, the natural basis, the miraculous element? (6) The significance, natural basis, and miraculous element in each of the following plagues? (7) Did the Egyptian priests really perform the miracles apparently ascribed to them, and if so, by whose assistance? (8) The time covered by the plagues?
- e) *The Passover*: (1) The spring-feast among ancient nations? (2) The origin of the passover? (3) The details? (4) Why was the lamb or kid chosen on the tenth, but not killed until the fourteenth day of the month? (5) Significance of its being a male without blemish, and a year old? (6) Why roasted and not boiled? (7) Why was every thing remaining to be burned the next morning? (8) The significance of the bitter herbs, of the unleavened bread? (9) The way in which the meal was taken? (10) The significance of the blood sprinkled on the door-posts and lintels of the houses?
- f) *The last plague*: (1) The curse? (2) The exemption of the Israelites? (3) The terror of the Egyptians? (4) The consent given to depart? (5) The law by which the first-born of man and beast in Israel were to be Jehovah's and to be redeemed only by a ransom?
- g) *The flight and the overthrow of Pharaoh*: (1) The number of people who left Egypt? (2) Difficulties attending the explanation of this number and their means of subsistence on the Sinaitic peninsula? (3) The mixed multitude that went forth with them? (4) The command that they "ask" jewelry from the Egyptians? (5) The assembling of the Israelites for departure? (6) The march to Succoth? (7) The march to Etham and the change of route here introduced? (8) Pi-hahiroth? (9) Reasons for not marching directly to Palestine? (10) The pursuit of Pharaoh? (11) Some of the more recent and more probable theories as to the point of crossing? (12) The dividing of the Red Sea and passing through of Israel? (13) The destruction of Pharaoh's army?
9. Take up for special study the *Song of Deliverance*, Exod. xv., and proceed as follows:—
- a) Read the chapter repeatedly, observing closely
- (1) All expressions which are not at first sight clear;
 - (2) The parallelism of the various members, the leading characteristic of Hebrew poetry;
 - (3) The logical connection of the divisions of the chapter.
- b) Make an analysis of the chapter which will include all the details.
- c) Classify the parallel members according as they are synonymous, antithetic or synthetic.
- d) Make a list of all the attributes or actions attributed to Jehovah, e. g., (v. 1) Jehovah hath triumphed gloriously.

- (v. 1) Jehovah hath thrown into the sea the horse and his rider.
- (v. 2) " is my strength and my song.
- " " is become my salvation.
- " " is my God, my father's God.
- (v. 3) " is a man of war.
- e) Make a list of the distinct assertions given in the chapter concerning the Egyptians.
- f) Select those figurative expressions which have not by this time become clear, and consult commentaries in reference to their interpretation.
- g) Write out a paraphrase of the chapter which shall not contain more than two hundred words.

10. In the case of each of the topics¹ here given (1) read carefully the portion of the Scripture narrative bearing on it; (2) prepare a list of questions which will bring out the important points; (3) study the questions with the help of such commentaries, Bible dictionaries, cyclopedias, histories and monographs as you may be able to consult:

- a) The thirty-eight years' wandering in the wilderness.
- b) The march from the Red Sea to Sinai.
- c) The miraculous supply of manna.
- d) The various views which identify Mount Serbal, Jebel Musa, and Ras Sasafeh as Mount Sinai.
- e) The scene and circumstances of the Sinaitic lawgiving.
- f) The Decalogue.
- g) The Laws in Exod. XXI.-XXIII.
- h) The completion of the Covenant and Moses' ascent into the cloud of Sinai.
- i) The Tabernacle, its furniture, and the attire of the priests (Exod. XXV.-XXXI.).
- j) The affair of the golden calf; the intercession; the restoration of the tables and the renewal of the Covenant (Exod. XXXII.-XXXIV.).
- k) The construction and erection of the Tabernacle (Exod. XXXV.-XL.).

11. With the knowledge of the Book of Exodus thus far gained, consider its relation to other books, viz., (1) Genesis, (2) Leviticus, (3) Numbers, (4) Deuteronomy, (5) the Pentateuch as a whole. Let this consideration be four-fold:

- a) A consideration of the historical relation of Exodus to each of these books and to the Pentateuch as a whole.
- b) A consideration of its logical connection with each of these books.
- c) A consideration of its characteristics, when compared with these books.
- d) A consideration of the *special purpose* of the writer and of the Holy Spirit in the preparation of this book.

12. Finally, inquire more or less closely into the literary form of the Book of Exodus. In this work the following points may be taken up:

¹ In attempting to cover the entire book in our outline "study," it is necessary to pass over thus hastily even the leading topics of the second half of the book. The purpose of the "study," however, viz., to indicate, in a most general way, a method of treatment which will result in a knowledge of the book as a whole, has been accomplished. What has been omitted by the writer, can easily be supplied by the student. Besides the commentaries on these chapters, and the articles in various Dictionaries and Cyclopedias, Palmer's *The Desert of the Exodus* (2 vols., Bell & Dally, London) is recommended. For a careful study of the Tabernacle according to the older views, Atwater's *Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews* (Dodd & Mead, N. Y.) may be consulted.

- a) The theory which would make Exodus the compilation by a later writer of two or three distinct historical accounts, with many traces of the work of this compiler or redactor :
 - (1) Arguments urged in support of this drawn from the different usage of words.
 - (2) Argument drawn from different style.
 - (3) Argument drawn from the alleged existence of double accounts of the same event.
 - (4) Argument drawn from the laws given in the book.
 - (5) Relation of this theory concerning the Book of Exodus to that concerning Genesis and the other books of the Pentateuch.
 - (6) The relation existing between these various documents.
- b) The theory which regards the book as characterized by strict unity :
 - (a) Arguments in favor of the unity of the book and its Mosaic authorship.
 - (b) Answers to the arguments (referred to above) urged against this unity and authorship.

III. PLAN OF CLASS-WORK.

As has already been stated, it is not supposed that any one person will feel inclined to work through, in all its details, such an outline as the above, meager and imperfect though it is. Some topics or parts of topics may be treated rapidly or altogether omitted. Should a *class* undertake to study the outline, the same option may be used. In this case, however, it will be possible

- (1) To consult the tastes of the various members of the class.
- (2) To relieve the class as a whole by assigning various topics to certain individuals, by whom the results of their study should be submitted to the class.

For a course of twenty class-studies on this book, it is suggested that each of the twelve sections into which the study is divided serve as the basis of two studies, except those numbered one, four, five and six, for which only one study each would be employed.

It is not to be inferred from this suggestion that there would thus be sufficient time in which to do the most thorough and the most satisfactory work. It will be possible, however, within this time to do at least two things :

- 1) To get a clear and comprehensive working-knowledge of the book as a whole, a knowledge absolutely essential for the correct understanding and interpretation of any particular chapter in it; and
- 2) To form a habit of broad, comprehensive study, which will be of the greatest aid to the student in any effort which he may make to treat other books of the Bible in a similar manner.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.
AUTOBIOGRAPHY; WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES
BY PROFESSOR HERMANN V. HILPRECHT, PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

February 23, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, *professor ordinarius* of theology in the University of Leipzig, entered on the seventy-fifth year of his age. There is scarcely another German or American theologian at the present time who has gained so great and widespread a reputation as has this venerable scholar, both in his own country and among other nations. For nearly half a century he has worked as an academical teacher, as a productive writer, and, chief of all, as the principal leader of the Jewish Mission. Students from all parts of the world have sat at his feet and come under his powerful influence. Even to-day, when he has reached and passed the usual boundaries of human life, his always over-crowded lectures, in the vast rooms of the flourishing Saxonian University, exercise the same attraction to his pupils as in that former period of his life when he, von Hofmann, Thomasius, Harnack, and other eminent men, raised the University of Erlangen to the seat of Lutheran theology and to the centre of scholarly life and faithful religious confession. This fact, which seems strange according to the general rule and experience of great academicians, finds its only reasonable explanation in his singular and unique personality. Indeed, that may well be added which cannot always be truly said of other scholars: Delitzsch has become old; but his teachings have remained fresh and young; and the notes of his lectures have not grown musty on the shelves of a fast-closed shrine. The man, with his natural disposition and talents of mind and heart,—the Christian, with his rich gifts of grace in faith and love,—and the scholar, with his thorough knowledge and his sharp faculty of judgment acquired by severe study and a restless activity of many years,—unite, in beautiful harmony, in Franz Delitzsch. For this very reason, the question sometimes raised, whether Delitzsch has proved greater as a man, or Christian, or scholar, can only be answered by the fact that, in the learned Hebraist and exegete, the faithful believer in Christ, with his unchangeable reverence for the Word of God, and the talented man, with his peculiar style, his expressive and vivid language, his speculative flight of thought and his poetical feeling, cannot be separated from each other.

Still, I will not try myself to describe Delitzsch's person and character, his life and his work. Professor S. D. F. Salmond rejoiced us last year with a short but excellent sketch of his Leipzig friend in *The Expositor*.¹ Another survey of the life and work of this scholar, written in Hebrew, and accompanied by a very fair four-fold poem celebrating the venerable friend of Israel, was dedicated to

¹ See *The Expositor*, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.), No. XVIII., June, 1886, pp. 456-471. The etched portrait, however, which accompanied the article of Professor Salmond in the same number, was very imperfect. A really good likeness of Franz Delitzsch (32 x 43 centimeters) was issued in phototype 1885, by the *Centralbureau* of the *Instituta Judaica* (W. Faber) Leipzig, Thalstrasse, and may be obtained from there for M.1.50.

Delitzsch on his seventieth birthday (1883), and afterwards published, with his permission, by A. M. Stengel, under the title "Words of Truth and Love."¹ Shorter or longer articles and notes regarding Delitzsch's activity and success in the Jewish Mission will be found in several periodicals.²

Comparatively few persons, however, in Europe or in America, are aware that Professor Delitzsch himself some years ago wrote some personal remembrances of his life,—as far as I know, the only biographical notes from his pen ever given to the public. The author tells only the most important events in his life, briefly and simply. Nevertheless, this autobiography contains several things which do not occur in any of the above mentioned sketches. For this reason, and out of regard for the general interest taken on this side of the ocean in the person, the life and the writings of Delitzsch, I herewith submit my translation from the Norwegian into English of this autobiography, hitherto confined to a small circle of readers.

The cause of the writing of this autobiography is easily told. The editor of a small Norwegian religious paper, *Missions-Blad for Israel*, to the columns of which the Leipzig professor has contributed some other articles, asked Delitzsch for an outline of his life, intended to be an illustration of the likeness in the number for April, 1883. In acknowledgement of the faithful services of the Norwegian church in the field of Jewish Missions, and out of gratitude for their important support afforded in the bringing out of his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, Delitzsch fulfilled the wishes of his dear friends, and sent the following sketch:³

"I was born in Leipzig, February 23, 1813, and was baptized March 4, in the church of St. Nicolai at the same place. My father, who was a native of Leipzig, had at this time, and while I was a boy, a shop where he dealt in second-hand goods, a so-called frippery. This brought him in very little; and I passed an arduous childhood. My father died April 4, 1836, fifty-four years old.

"My benefactor from childhood was a Jew, called Hirsch Levy; he lived with us, and dealt in books. If it had not been for him, I could never have succeeded in studying. First, I went to a boys' school, and after that I attended the free

דברי אמת ואהבה אשר רחש לבי¹ The exact title of the little interesting pamphlet (p. 32) is
בשנה העברה, שנת 1883, בחרש השני הוא פִּינְבְּרוּאָר, בשלשה ועשרים יום בו, עת מלאת
שבעים שנה ליום הולדת איש רב תבונות, רגול מרבבה לוחם כנבור מלחמת האמת והצדק
ובאחר מגדולי ישראל יד ושם לו בחכמת ישרון וכפרותו, דורש שלום עם ישראל וטובתו, הלא
הוא החכם המפואר הישיש הנכבד פֶּרָאָפֶּססָאָר פֶּרָאָנִין דְּעֵלִישִׁיט בעיר ליפסא.
יצא לאור בשנת { טהר-לב וידים }
יכ"ף ימים-חיים! { לפ"ק.
ליום מלאת לו אחת ושבעים שנה מאת א. מ. שטעננעקל.

Wien, 1884, at the author's personal expenses, II., Rembrandt-Str. 4.

² A brief essay, "Franz Delitzsch in his relation to Israel," written by me for *The Lutheran Church Review*, edited by Rev. Professor H. E. Jacobs, D. D. (Philadelphia, The Alumni Association of the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary) will appear in its second number, April, 1887.

³ Very appropriately the editor of the *Missions-Blad* remarks, in a note added to the lines of Delitzsch, pp. 51-54: "We have not been able, nor thought it proper, to send out missionaries among the Jews; but we have shared in the sending of the greatest missionary since the ascension of our Lord, the Holy Scriptures. What an honor for our 'low ehreuh' and for our people, to have had a part!"

school, of the town, where, at this time, Plato was director, and Dolz vice-director. Here I became a decided rationalist. I felt myself drawn to God; but the person of Jesus Christ was to me involved in utter darkness. I went to the university to study philosophy and philology; and while seeking for truth, I became absorbed in the systems of the great German philosophers: Fichte especially captivated me.

"But one of my university fellows, called Schütz, who had found the Saviour, and loved him, worked incessantly to bring me to believe. I resisted a long time; but this very day I could point out the place (in one of Leipzig's streets) where a light from above put me into the same state as Thomas when he exclaimed 'My Lord and my God!' Henceforth I became a theologian, and familiar with students who had been awakened by the mercy of God. There were also domestic circles of believers in Leipzig, where now I felt quite at home. The years from 1832 to 1834, my last three years at the university, were the happiest of my life; they were the spring of my spiritual life, the days of my first love.

"I also became associated with the missionaries of the Jews, Goldberg and Becker, who, in carrying on their work, visited the fairs of Leipzig. It was these two men who first taught me to love that people from which the Saviour descended, and taught me to pray for the conversion to Christ of those who had betrayed him. Now, when I am called 'the celebrated Hebraist,' it sounds strange when I say that the missionary Becker gave me the first rabbinical instruction; but so it was. I had brought some knowledge of Hebrew with me from the gymnasium; and this language became my favorite study. My studies of the Rabbinic began with the reading of the tract 'Or le'êth eres' (Light by eventide), with the missionary Becker.

"I found in my benefactor Hirsch an object for work. My interest in him brought not early but ripe fruit. May 10, 1843, my dearest benefactor was baptized; and two years after he passed away in peace.

"For seven years (from 1835 to 1842) I led the devotional gatherings in a circle of believing friends. Some of the members are still alive; they stand, thank God! firm in faith; and when we meet, we confess that our anchor still holds in the old ground. Thus practically occupied on the one hand, I devoted myself, on the other, entirely to the study of Hebrew and of the Old Testament. This led me to Rosenmüller's¹ school, and then in particular connection with Fleischer² and with my dear Paul Caspari.³ Our aim was the same; and although

¹ Ernst Friedrich Karl Rosenmüller, son of the not less famous Johann Georg Rosenmüller, who died as professor of theology in Leipzig, 1815, studied and taught afterwards as *privat-docent* (1792), *professor extraordinarius* (1796) and *professor ordinarius* (1813-1835) of the oriental languages in the University of Leipzig. As academical teacher, he effected more through his great influence in personally advising and forwarding students in their work than through his attractiveness in the class-room. Rosenmüller's literary fertility is known. Of his numerous writings, "Das alte und neue Morgenland" (6 volumes, Leipzig, 1818-20) and "Scholia in Vetus Testamentum" (ed. ult. XI partes in 23 voll., 1820-35) are the most important. See article "Rosenmüller" in Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie, 2. ed., vol. 13, pp. 69 seq.

² H. O. Fleischer, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D., *professor ordinarius* of oriental languages in the University of Leipzig, and the greatest living authority in Arabic philology. As writer, he is well known by his edition of "Beidhawl Commentarius in Coranum," 2 volumina, Lipsiæ, 1846-48, and by a great many essays of high value published in various scientific papers. Although more than eighty-five years old, Professor Fleischer still enjoys good health, devotes himself to literary work, and gathers round him a circle of advanced students and scholars, to whom he delivers his learned and attractive lectures.

³ C. Paul Caspari, Doctor and Professor of theology in Christiania, Norway, and President of

we were of different natures, we conceived an affection for each other, becoming intimate friends. And now, seeing this friend of mine among the representatives of the Norwegian church and of the Norwegian mission, I praise the merciful guidance of God.

"Up to this point I have not mentioned my mother. She was a daughter of a musician in a little town between Leipzig and Halle. When she became a widow, and was alone in the world, she started a little second-hand book-store; and even after I was elected professor, my mother still dealt in old books. This contrast grieved me much. But she wished to be independent, and for that she could not be blamed. She was an honest woman; she was respected and beloved by all who knew her. She took very little pleasure in this world; and when she died in my arms, December 7, 1857, she was happy to pass away. I am not the only one who visits her tomb from time to time. She was a faithful cross-bearer, to whom the words 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much' (Lk. vii. 47) may well be applied.

"I have often been asked for my biography; but I have never yet been so communicative as now in the case of my Norwegian brethren. My after life and work are easily told. In the year 1842 I 'habilitated' myself in Leipzig with a thesis on the prophet Habakkuk.¹ My communion-book² originated from the devotional gatherings which I conducted; and in my youthful enthusiasm for the Jewish literature, I wrote my book the 'History of the post-Biblical Jewish Poetry.'³ In the year 1846 I became professor in Rostock, 1850 in Erlangen, and 1867 in Leipzig, where I now hope to stay until my blessed end. In Erlangen I founded, in the year 1863, a journal devoted to the Jewish Mission, *Saat auf Hoffnung*. My Hebrew New Testament, which was issued in 1877, is now to be printed in the fifth edition.⁴ It is owing for the most part to the generosity of the Norwegian brethren, that this publication was made possible.

"I made the acquaintance of my wife by means of our devotional gatherings. Her mother and brother confessed Christ. We were married April 27, 1845. The fruit of this marriage was four sons. The oldest, Johannes, died while *professor extraordinarius* of theology, February 3, 1876, just as he had finished the editing

the Norwegian society for Jewish missions, is known both as a Semitic scholar by his useful "Arabische Grammatik" (4. edition issued by August Müller, Halle, 1876), and as a profound and reliable investigator in early Christian church history by his "Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel" (3 volumes; Christiania, 1866-75), by his "Bibelske Afhandlinger," and by his "Eine Augustin fälschlich beigelegte Homilia de sacrilegiis" (Christiania, 1886).

¹ Afterwards published in book-form under the title "Der Prophet Habakkuk," ausgelegt von Franz Delitzsch, Leipzig, 1843.

² "Das Sakrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi, Beicht- und Kommunionbuch." It was first published in 1844, and reached its seventh edition in 1886 (Leipzig: J. Neumann). Together with other works of Delitzsch, it has been translated into Norwegian.

³ "Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie" vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit. Leipzig, 1896.

⁴ The fifth edition having been sold speedily, a sixth followed at the end of 1884. In the following year (1885) an entirely revised octavo edition, with larger letters, was issued by Dr. Delitzsch, out of regard to the wishes expressed in Kishinev that the New Testament might be uniform with the Hebrew Old Testament by the British and Foreign Bible Society. As to the superiority of Delitzsch's last (octavo) edition in comparison with the version of Isaac Salkinson, published after his death at the expenses of the English Trinity Bible Society, 1885, see the articles "Delitzsch" and Salkinsons Hebräisches Neues Testament" in *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (edited by Prof. Dr. C. E. Luthardt, Leipzig), Nos. 45, 46, 47, pp. 431, 447, 455; and "Two Hebrew New Testaments" (by Rev. Prof. S. R. Driver, D. D.) in *The Expositor*, April, 1886, pp. 260 seq.

of Oehler's *Symbolik*.¹ He lies buried in the Evangelic church-yard in Genoa. His brother, Ernst, had already died January 17, 1872; he had served as assistant surgeon in the Franco-German war from its beginning to its end. Not until a long time after the conclusion of peace could he return. After a long illness, he succumbed from an acute pulmonary attack. His grave is in Leipzig. My two youngest sons are still alive. The older of them, Hermann, has an appointment with the general German Credit-bank; and the youngest, Friedrich (born September 3, 1850), *professor extraordinarius* of Assyriology,² is at present at the British Museum in London, where he continues his studies in the preparation of a Babylonian-Assyrian dictionary.

"I completed my seventieth year February 23. Although I dislike ovations of every kind, I was made more of than I could almost bear. But also many blessings have been showered upon me, especially from missionary societies abroad; and those blessings sound as sweet in my ears, as the lullaby sounds to the child, when it is lulled to sleep."

AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN PALESTINE.

BY PROFESSOR E. C. MITCHELL, D. D.,

Cambridge, Mass.

The historical method has come to be generally accepted as essential to a true science of interpretation. To know what writers mean, we must know who they were and what were the circumstances and conditions under which they wrote.

It is equally true that historical inquiry, to be thorough and trustworthy, must be based upon some geographical knowledge. To comprehend events we must have some idea of localities. To appreciate actions we must accurately conceive of the situation. To estimate character, motives, methods of thought, habits of expression, we must know the surroundings.

This general principle is especially applicable to the science of biblical interpretation. So large a part of Sacred Scripture is in its nature historical, and so much of this history is dependent upon geographical conditions, that a prime requisite for obtaining any just idea of the sense is to know the place and the

¹ He published, in addition, "*De inspiratione Scripturae Sacrae quid statuerint patres apostolici et apologetae secundi saeculi*," by which writing he qualified, in 1872, as a university teacher. But he died before he could finish his work on the *Doctrinal System of the Roman Catholic church* ("*Das Lehrsystem der römischen Kirche*," vol. I., 1875).

² Friedrich Delitzsch, to whom, as far as I know, all the present professors of Assyrian in the universities of the United States are indebted as a teacher, was elected, in 1885, *professor ordinarius honorarius* of Assyriology and of the Semitic languages in the University of Leipzig. The next result of his investigations in London, which lasted from March to October, 1883, was a series of articles which appeared in the *Athenaeum* under the title "The importance of Assyriology to Hebrew lexicography," afterwards published in pamphlet-form as "The Hebrew language viewed in the light of Assyrian research" (London: Williams & Norgate, 1883) and "*Die Sprache der Kossäer*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1884). According to the statement given on p. 24 in the latter work, the above mentioned dictionary has now been finished for more than two years. We are, therefore, entitled to hope that Friedrich Delitzsch, having issued in the mean time the third edition of his "*Assyrische Lesestücke*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1885), and his "*Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*" (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1886) will this year begin the publication of his often promised and long expected Assyrian dictionary.

time. Indeed the very language itself, especially of the Old Testament, has largely an historico-geographical origin. The phraseology and imagery, especially the poetical conceptions of the writers, are derived from peculiarities of physical features in sacred lands, or from historical incidents in the lives of their inhabitants.

To lay a sure substructure for the biblical interpreter, therefore, the first step is thorough topographical investigation.

This truth has been recognized more or less distinctly by all the earlier Palestine travelers, although any such like scientific research must date its beginnings in the present century. Seetzen, Burckhardt and Irby and Mangles did something to awaken a spirit of inquiry and experiment upon the work. It was reserved for an American to inaugurate upon a scientific basis a system of exploration, the fruits of which are now enriching our literature and preparing the way for definite and accurate scriptural knowledge.

"Scientific exploration,"—say the eminent British engineers Charles Warren and Claude R. Conder, in their recently published *Survey of Western Palestine*, p. 87,—“dates from the first visit of Dr. Robinson in 1838,” and in the official history of the work of the London Society in 1873 it is said that “the first real impulse, because the first successful impulse, toward scientific examination of the Holy Land is due to the American traveler Dr. Robinson. He it was who first conceived the idea of making a work on biblical geography, to be based, not on the accounts of others, but on his own observations and discoveries. He fitted himself for his ambitious undertaking by the special studies of fifteen years, mastering the whole literature of the subject, and, above all, clearing the way for his own researches by noticing the deficiencies and weak points of his predecessors. He went, therefore, *knowing what to look for* and what had already been found” . . . “Dr. Robinson seems first to have recognized that most important aid to biblical identification, the modern Arabic names, and his work (first edition) contains a very valuable list of names, chiefly collected by Dr. Eli Smith. Dr. Robinson, starting with the broad canon ‘that all ecclesiastical tradition respecting the sacred places in and around Jerusalem and throughout Palestine is of no value, except so far as it is supported by circumstances known to us from Scripture, or from other contemporary history,’ was the first (except the German book-seller Korte, of the eighteenth century) to impugn the accuracy of the traditional sites. We shall not go into the question here of his theories, and his reconstruction of the old city, on which he has had both followers and opponents. Let it, however, be distinctly remembered that Dr. Robinson is the *first* of scientific travelers. His travels took him over a very large extent of ground, covering a large part of the whole country from Sinai north, and his books are still, after thirty years, the most valuable works which we possess on the geography of Palestine.”¹

This tribute, from so high a source, so ingenuously bestowed, requires no addition from us, except to say that it is re-echoed, in grateful expression, by biblical scholars and especially by oriental travelers of all nations.

It may truly be said that one discovery of Dr. Robinson, that of the arch over the Tyropean valley, has done more to stimulate and promote exploration in the city of Jerusalem than any other before or since. It furnished the starting-point, the *ποῦ στῶ*, for a definite system of topographical research. The interest awakened by it, the discussions growing out of it, the laborious researches instituted by the

¹ *Our Work in Palestine*. Issued by the Committee. London, 1873.

London Society, which have resulted in substantially confirming his conjectures, form no inconsiderable part of the history which Palestine exploration has made, up to the present time.

While a deserved meed of praise is thus gratefully accorded, on both continents, to this eminent American scholar for his pioneer labors in scientific exploration, there is another name which ought to be remembered in close connection with his. On the title page of both the earlier and later researches of Dr. Robinson, Eli Smith, D. D., missionary of the American Board at Beirut, appears as the joint author. Dr. Smith was the companion of all his travels and the interpreter for all his intercourse with the native population. His long residence in the country, his scholarly familiarity with the Arabic tongue and its cognate dialects, and his intelligent sympathy with Dr. Robinson in the work of exploration, rendered his presence well-nigh indispensable to any such result as the expedition was enabled to accomplish.

It would seem as if, under so illustrious a leadership, American scholars should have taken the foremost place as explorers of Bible lands; and it is but fair to say that much good work has been done by Americans during the last half century. It was apparently through the inspiration of Dr. Robinson's earlier researches that Lieutenants Lynch and Dale, of the United States navy, conceived the idea of a scientific exploration of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. Before sailing, in November, 1847, to join the squadron in the Mediterranean, they conferred with Dr. Robinson respecting the remarkable phenomena connected with the depression of the Jordan valley.¹ Having obtained permission of the government, a United States exploring expedition was organized, with Lieut. W. F. Lynch at its head. In April, 1848, the party descended the Jordan in metal boats, one of iron and one of copper, and their reports furnish the first trustworthy data respecting the physical conformation of the Dead Sea and its exact elevation, or rather depression, below the level of the Mediterranean. The expedition had a melancholy outcome, on account of the death of Lieut. Dale, who succumbed to nervous fever, the result of fatigue and exposure, and was buried at Beirut. He was a fine young officer and an experienced engineer.² The volume which Lieut. Lynch published was regarded in Great Britain as "one of the most valuable contributions to geographical science which had been made for years, conferring honor upon the American government, and especially upon the officers and men who carried the enterprise through in the face of such appalling difficulties."³ The book went through six editions in the first year, with an aggregate sale of 11,000 copies.⁴

One of the earliest careful explorations of the source of the Jordan, the report of which is described by Dr. Robinson as "the first good account that we possess"⁵ was made in 1844 by Rev. W. M. Thomson, then a missionary of the American Board in Syria, and ever since recognized as standing in the front rank among Palestine explorers. Possessing exceptional advantages of position as a permanent resident in the country, and being perfectly familiar with the tongue and the people, a thorough scholar, not only in theological but in physical science, trained to careful habits of observation, and inspired with a real enthusiasm for antiquarian and especially biblical research, Dr. Thomson seems to have been providen-

¹ Bib. Sac., vol. II., p. 397. ² Bib. Sac., V., 769. ³ Bib. Sac., vol. VI., p. 803. ⁴ Bib. Sac., VII., 393. ⁵ Bib. Sac., III., 207.

tially commissioned to do a great and valuable work for the elucidation of scriptural truth. As long ago as 1859, it was truly said¹ that "if the Syrian mission had produced no other fruit" than "The Land and the Book" (a first edition of which was then just issued), "the churches which have supported that mission would have received an ample return for all the money they have expended."² Dr. Thomson was one of the companions of Dr. Robinson during a part of his later researches, and ever after was his correspondent in matters pertaining to Palestine, contributing many valuable facts to the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of which Dr. Robinson was the founder and for fourteen years an associate editor.

Nor are Drs. Smith and Thomson the only American missionaries who have made valuable contributions to the literature of the subject. In 1869 the Rev. Thomas Laurie prepared and published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, a scholarly and valuable description of Mount Lebanon, its physical geography, productions, people and antiquities; and, a few years later, the Rev. Henry J. von Lemnep, D. D., published a goodly volume containing one of the most extended and comprehensive treatises on the customs, habits, and social life of the inhabitants of Palestine which has yet appeared. It is entitled "Bible Lands: their modern customs and manners, illustrative of Scripture." It has over three hundred illustrations.³

Nor must we forget that it was an American missionary to the Jews of Palestine, to whom we are indebted for one of the earliest and most trustworthy descriptions of the Holy City, and for several valuable discoveries in connection with it. Dr. J. T. Barclay took up his abode in Jerusalem in February, 1851, a little over a year previous to Dr. Robinson's second visit, and remained there for three and a half years. "He was an enthusiastic explorer and an acute, and, in the main, accurate observer."⁴ His "City of the Great King" was in its time one of the most valuable contributions to the topography of Jerusalem, on either continent. His discovery of the great quarry under Bezetha is scarcely second in importance to any which has since been made in underground Jerusalem. His minor discoveries, identifications and conjectures stood the test of time better than the average, and are, on the whole, remarkable, considering the material then at his disposal. Those who now contend for the honor of having first suggested a northern site for Golgotha, may take interest in being reminded that Dr. Barclay suffered some obloquy for having propounded such a theory more than thirty years ago. Although he did not select the precise spot which is now favored by many, his statement of reasons, both negative and positive, is in the main exhaustive and quite well suited to fit the hypothesis now presented.

In the early part of 1871, a society was organized in New York city, entitled the "Palestine Exploration Society," which was designed to co-operate with the "Palestine Exploration Fund," of London. Of this society, Prof. Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., was made president, and Rev. Howard Crosby, D. D., LL. D., secretary. An advisory committee was appointed in Syria, consisting of Dr. W. M. Thomson and other missionaries at Beirut, and the consul at Beirut, and at Alexandria, Egypt. An agreement was entered into with the London

¹ Bib. Sac., XVI., 438.

² Prof. Wm. S. Tyler, D. D., LL. D., Bib. Sac., XVI., 438.

³ New York, 1875.

⁴ Dr. J. P. Thomson in Bib. Sac., XVI., 448.

Society that the country east of the Jordan should be reserved as the special field of the American explorers. "For the first year of its existence (1871) the society was looking for engineers and competent men to explore and map the country east of the Jordan. In the summer of 1872, Lieut. Steever, of the United States army, was put in command, and in March, 1873, the expedition took the field." ("Second statement.") Two persons only were sent from America, viz., Lieut. Edgar Z. Steever, Jr., a recent graduate of West Point, and Prof. John A. Paine, formerly of Robert College, Constantinople, who was to serve as archaeologist and naturalist of the expedition. They sailed from America in September, 1872, and arrived at Beirut, Syria, January 6, 1873. At Beirut they were joined by Rev. A. A. Haines, of Hamburg, N. J., as first-assistant engineer, and Wm. G. Ballantine, A. B., of Indiana, as second-assistant engineer, with five native assistants. The report of Lieut. Steever, entitled "Our first year in the field," was published in the "Second Statement" the society issued September, 1873. The expedition had surveyed trigonometrically, on the scale of one inch to the mile, nearly the entire district from Ammon south to the Arnon, or Moab proper, an area of over 500 square miles.

The "Second Statement" also contains an account of discoveries at Nahr-el-Kelb, made by Professor Paine, consisting of three Greek inscriptions, one on a stone in a Roman wall, and two cut in rock; a paper by Wm. Hays Ward, D. D., LL. D., on "The Hamath Inscriptions," and a description of "Husn Sulayman," a magnificent ruin, by the Rev. Samuel Jessup, American missionary.

In January, 1875, a "Third Statement" was published, consisting of 140 pages, made up entirely of these articles, by Professor Paine, viz., the "Identification of Mount Pisgah," "Plants collected in Eastern Palestine," and "An Index of Arabic Names."

Professor Paine has ever since devoted himself to studies connected with biblical geography, and has contributed many articles to the biblical research column of the *Independent*, as well as to the *Sunday School Times*, *Evangelist*, *Examiner*, *Watchman*, and to the *London Athenæum* and *Academy*. Some discussions of this subject he has also published in the *Journal of Christian Philosophy*, of which he is the conductor. He has gathered around him a large collection of aids for the study of biblical geography, and performed much labor, the fruit of which, it is hoped, may yet be given to the public.

A second expedition was afterward started, under command of Col. J. C. Lane, and the preliminary reconnaissance was reported and published in the "Fourth Statement." For some reason the full survey was never carried into effect, and Colonel Lane shortly after returned to this country. Some fruits of his observations were, however, reported in writing and handed over to the London Society, to be used by them in their future explorations.

The Rev. Selah Merrill, D. D., LL. D., was the archaeologist for this second expedition. His report occupies seventy-one pages of the "Fourth Statement." He remained two entire years (1875-77) in the country engaged in exploration. During this period he prepared and has since published two books which will have a permanent value in biblical literature. One is a description of "Galilee in the Time of Christ," in which several popular errors respecting the natural features and the political importance of that province are corrected. The other is a "Record of travel and observation in the countries of Moab, Gilead and Bashan during the years 1875-77," and is entitled "East of the Jordan." He has also written

many letters to American and English journals, especially the New York *Independent* and the London *Athenæum*, containing the results of his observations. His contributions to the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and to the "Quarterly Statement" of the Palestine Exploration Fund of London, would fill quite a volume. Shortly after the close of his engagement in the service of the Exploration Society, Dr. Merrill was appointed United States consul at Jerusalem and took up his residence there. In this position he has enjoyed, for several years, exceptional advantages for observation, especially in matters relating to the Holy City. He has also been able to contribute much valuable advice and assistance to other American and English travelers and explorers, while pursuing their investigations in the Holy Land.

Dr. Merrill has recently returned to America, bringing with him,—besides an added store of experience and observation,—a large collection of tangible objects, relics, photographs, mementos and specimens, including the largest collection of birds and animals probably ever made, which might form the nucleus of a fine museum of sacred antiquities and biblical illustration. Such a museum might be made exceedingly useful to Bible-students in this country.

The idea of a biblical museum was conceived of several years ago. In 1869, a society was organized by Robert Morris, LL. D., of LaGrange, Ky., entitled the "Scholars' Holy Land Exploration." Its objects were—(1) The collection and distribution of reliable specimens from the Holy Land; (2) the delivery of popular lectures upon subjects of scriptural research; (3) the publication of tracts and magazines, and the translation of valuable works; and (4) the organization of expeditions to the Holy Land. In 1871 this society claimed to have a membership of over eight hundred, embracing many eminent names. A magazine was started entitled *Holy Land*, the first number of which, in January, 1871, contained articles on "The Geology of the Holy Land," by Prof. Richard Owen, LL. D., of the University of Indiana, and on "The Crusades," by Prof. H. H. Fairall, of Decorah, Iowa. The Secretary of the Society, Dr. Morris, had brought from Palestine a large collection of objects,—coins, shells, minerals, seeds and relics,—and arranged a plan for delivering them to Sabbath-schools in little cabinets, with descriptive labels. Most of them were stored in the office of the Treasurer, Col. H. J. Goodrich, of Chicago, and were destroyed in the great fire of October 9, '71. This, and other circumstances, seem to have discouraged the directors of the Society, and a few years later its active operations were discontinued.

Besides these fruits of organized effort in Palestine exploration, there have been many contributions to the subject from individual travelers. Probably no nation sends so large a delegation of intelligent visitors to the East as our own. When Captain (now Sir Charles) Warren was in charge of the explorations at Jerusalem, he was quite impressed with the interest taken in them by Americans. He says, in "Underground Jerusalem," p. 93: "I must admit that the manner in which many of the Americans were well grounded in Palestine topography surprised me; they accounted for it by telling me that their clergy make a point of explaining and describing it from the pulpit frequently. Besides this, many of their ministers are sent to Palestine by their congregations, in order that they may refresh their minds, and take in a fresh stock of biblical lore; in return for this, they send home a letter each fortnight, describing their wanderings, to be read in their churches."

Perhaps we had better receive this compliment to American congregations in

grateful silence, affording, as it does, a suggestive hint of what, at all events, might and ought to be the truth. But the fact remains that a very large number of Americans have published accounts of their observations in Palestine, too large to be separately mentioned here. In a subsequent number of this journal, an attempt will be made to give a bibliographical list, embracing books and review-articles by Americans, on subjects connected with biblical research, as well as to complete our account of American explorers by noticing what our countrymen have done to help the work in Egypt and Assyria.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

MARCH 13. JACOB AT BETHEL. Gen. XXVIII. 10-22.

Is this narrative repeated in Gen. XXXV. with such contradictions as to prove that one or both are legendary and untrue? This narrative seems to affirm that Jacob, at the time of the incident recorded, called the name of the place Bethel; and this view of the case is taken in Gen. XXXI. 13 and XXXV. 1, 3, where the place is called Bethel, not by the writer, but by God, or by Jacob, speaking at a particular date. On the occasion of the incident, also, this narrative says that Jacob set up one of the stones of the place as a memorial-pillar, and anointed it. Is it a thing too absurd for belief that many years later, after passing through great changes, keeping still in mind the spiritual experiences he had here felt, he should have deliberately returned to the place, offering solemn worship here, renewing the name Bethel, and again setting up and anointing a memorial-pillar of stone? See Gen. XXXV. 7, 14, 15. To me it seems not at all absurd, but something very true to experience. I find, therefore, no reason for denying the historicity of either account, and thus far, none for assigning the two accounts to different sources of information, and certainly none for regarding the *'oldh.* XXXV. 9, as a lame attempt, by an editor, to harmonize two conflicting stories.

It is the *place* that is called Bethel, in each account, and not necessarily the neighboring city; that continued to be known as Luz, till after Joshua's time, when a fugitive from it built the Luz in the land of the Hittites, Judg. i. 22-26. In the circumstances, the city may very likely have been known by both names. From Gen. XXVIII. 19 and XXXV. 6 (but compare XLVIII. 3), it may be plausibly conjectured (not inferred, properly speaking) that the accounts were written in their present form after the fall of the Canaanite Luz, and the building of the other,—within the life-time of the public men who were associated with Moses.

Formerly it was held that Jacob's six years of service with Laban for cattle followed immediately after his fourteen years of service for his two wives, and that he was therefore about seventy-six years old, when he left Isaac; but this involves, by necessary inference, quite a list of absurdities. It is for the interest of men who wish to prove Genesis to be unhistorical to insist upon this interpretation, but it cannot fairly be maintained. Many now teach that an interval of twenty years occurred between the two terms of Jacob's service, and that he was therefore fifty-six years old at leaving Beer-sheba. I know of no solid foundation

for this *twenty*; but I suppose it is safe to assert that the accounts require us to hold that there was a long interval between the two terms. Jacob was between forty and seventy-six years of age at starting; the account of the births of Leah's children proves that he must have been considerably younger than seventy-six; that of the birth of Benjamin that he must have been considerably older than forty.

Especially as interpreted in the light of his subsequent career, Jacob's experience at Bethel is seen to be, at best, not that of a thoroughly sanctified man. Comparing Gen. XXVIII. 16-22 with Gen. XXXII. 9-12, we find in the latter a consciousness of ill-desert, a gratitude for mercies received, a dependence on divine grace, which do not appear in the former. Jacob at Bethel was going into great temptations, and was about to be led very far astray; the experience at Bethel was given him that its influence might abide with him, and prevent his straying beyond return.

MARCH 20. JACOB'S NEW NAME. Gen. XXXII. 9-12, 24-30.

Is this account of the giving of the name Israel duplicated, with contradictions, in Gen. XXXV. 10? or are these two different incidents, as they purport to be? Is there anything violently incredible in the idea that Jehovah may have repeated at Bethel the blessing he had granted at Peniel? This is one of the thousand instances that are cited to prove that the Bible-narratives are not historically credible; but most of the thousand are as weak as this, for that purpose.

The central fact in this chapter and the next is that Jacob made to Esau the fullest restitution in his power for the wrongs he had formerly done him, in the matter of the birthright and the blessing. He and his whole family publicly and formally acknowledged that he had no claim to the birthright or the blessing, arising from those fraudulent transactions, and that Esau was still in lawful possession of the birthright, and was therefore lord, and Jacob servant, Gen. XXXII. 4, 5, 18, 20; XXXIII. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15. It is strange that so important a fact has been so generally overlooked, in treating of the life of Jacob. God had decreed, before the brothers were born, that Jacob should have the pre-eminence; in good time God saw that the decree was executed; but as long as Jacob persisted in trying to execute God's purpose by fraud, for his own benefit, all his efforts proved failures; he had to abandon them, and make reparation for them, and leave the whole matter with God, that He might do as He saw fit, before he had any benefit from God's gracious purposes toward him.

The second section of the Sunday-school lesson is not an account of Jacob's continuing the supplication he had made in the first section. His attempt at reparation has brought him into great danger; he has prayed over that danger, and made his arrangements to meet it, and has left this whole matter in God's hands. But Jehovah, having secured Jacob's surrender in this matter of giving up his life-long sin, now wrestles all night with him to lead him to a complete and final self-surrender. As the day breaks, Jacob at last yields, and receives his new name.

The true rendering in verse 29 is, the revisers to the contrary notwithstanding, "for thou art a prince with God and with men, and prevailest." The idea of princely power is the one idea clearly found by Hebrew usage in the curiously mixed group of words here represented; it is not scientific to substitute for this, in three or four passages, an idea that fits less well, derived from a conjectural etymology. The point in regard to the new name is not that it gives renewed assurance of deliverance from the present danger from Esau, though such assur-

ance may be a fact ; it is that the new name represents a new character, in which character the man is to be a success, as he has been a failure in the old character represented by the old name.

APRIL 3. JOSEPH SOLD INTO EGYPT. Gen. XXXVII. 23-36.

It is clearly possible to dissect this story into two parts, to imagine that the two parts were originally two separate and contradictory stories that have been pieced together,—one story representing that Potiphar was a eunuch, and the other that he had a wife ; one saying that the traders who sold Joseph were Midianites, and the other that they were Ishmaelites ; one story saying that his brother drew Joseph from the pit, but the other that this was done by Midianite traders. But it is also clear that the story, as it stands, is a perfectly clear, flowing, circumstantial narrative, which requires no dissection in order to account for it. So far as the passage by itself is concerned, scientific criticism is bound to accept the less complicated account of its origin.

In treating of the character of Joseph's brothers, it is to be hoped that our Sunday-schools, this time, will escape the stale gush that has sometimes been indulged in over these bad sons of a saintly old father. Jacob's wickedness to Esau had put him in shape so that he could not marry the woman he loved, except upon the humiliating terms exacted from him by her father. These circumstances had drawn him into polygamy, and into a life of habitual give-and-take fraudulent practices in his dealings with Laban, and had destroyed all the influence he might have had as an advocate, in his family and out of it, of the true religion. All his children, except Benjamin, were born of idolatrous mothers. All except Benjamin and Joseph were reared to maturity (Dinah seems to have been a young lady when they reached Palestine, see Gen. XXXIV.) under the influence of idolatry, domestic quarrels and fraudulent dealings with kindred. In the shameful conduct of his children, and all the misery it brought, Jacob reaped what he himself had deliberately sown. He had become a changed man in his old age, but that did not prevent the maturing of these bad harvests whose seed had already sprouted. Jacob would have avoided all these evils if he had reached in early life the decision he reached at Peniel.

It is sometimes alleged that these narratives concerning the patriarchs are incredible, if regarded as accounts of what occurred to individual men, and should therefore be regarded as semi-allegorical accounts of what occurred to peoples, or clans ; Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for instance, not being persons, but impersonations of real or supposed facts in the history of Israel. As most of those who hold this view regard the history thus allegorically related as itself legendary and unhistorical, the distinction is not important for the purposes of apologetics. Probably there can be no objection to regarding some parts of Genesis as of the nature of a history of peoples or of movements, under the guise of a biography of persons, provided sufficient reasons for it can be adduced ; but generally speaking, the reasons alleged are not sufficient. The extraordinarily long lives of the patriarchs is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the evident purpose is to represent them as a remarkably vigorous and long-lived stock. The accounts represent Esau, and by parity, Ishmael, Midian, Moab, Ammon, etc., as becoming heads of peoples, not purely by the process of lineal descent, but by alliances, and by acquiring personal influence among their neighbors. Remembering such facts as these, and following a common-sense interpretation of the accounts, most of them can be understood as being the personal biographies they seem on their face to be.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

The most advanced Old Testament critics hold that the worship of Jehovah in the religion of Israel was the result of a natural process, as was the worship of the various national gods by the peoples around the Israelites; and that, in its earliest stages, the worship of Jehovah was connected with image-worship of this national god. Professor König, of Leipzig, has commenced the publication of a series of articles in which he takes a decided position against these views. The first of the series maintains the position that the Jehovah cultus was not a natural product, but the result of a revelation; and as a proof of this, he shows that, from the very beginning, the legitimate worship of Jehovah, in the consciousness of the people, was divorced from all idols and images, and that this remained the conviction of the best representatives of theocracy throughout the whole Old Testament history.

In Dawson's newest work (*Egypt and Syria; their physical features in relation to Bible History*) special attention is paid to the two chief neighbors of Israel in relation to the physical character of the country and the problem concerning their earliest settlements. Contrary to the assertions of many Egyptologists, who claim that Egypt was settled as early as five or six thousand years before Christ, he maintains that the character of the Nile valley points to a settlement of only about three thousand years before Christ, and that the immigration came from the south-west. He claims that the first builders of Memphis were the immediate successors of the generation that survived the flood, and may in part have been their contemporaries. The mysterious Hyksos, who seem to have ruled over Egypt in the days of Jacob and Joseph, are considered by Dawson to have been Asiatic immigrants of a Turanian or Mongolian type. Their pictures on old Egyptian monuments show a resemblance in face and attitude to the Red Men of North America. He interprets the name Hyksos as Og-(Huk)-Susim, which is interpreted "King of Susim." Cf. Gen. XIV. 5.

From a letter sent by an educated German gentleman, of Haifa, who for many years has been a resident in Palestine, and dated the 7th of November, 1886, we learn some interesting facts about the grapes of the Holy Land. The cultivation of the vine is still extensively carried on in Palestine, especially by the German colonists from South Germany, the so-called Temple Society, who have come to the Holy Land to live, and have done much for the improvement of agriculture, manufacture, etc. During the past summer, the weather was not favorable for grapes; June was very hot, and the Sirocco did much damage, literally roasting the grapes that were not well protected by leaves. In the Phœnician hills the vine did better, and five hundred pounds of the best of grapes sold for from \$3.90 to \$4.50. The writer of the letter mentions the remarkable fact that, at Acco, a single bunch of grapes was brought to market which weighed fully twelve pounds. He asks whether this does not forcibly remind us of the narrative of Joshua and Caleb. In view of the fact that such small prices can be had for grapes and wine, the colonists are beginning to export the wine to Egypt.

→BOOK:NOTICES.<

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: LEVITICUS, NUMBERS AND DEUTERONOMY.*

No one can for a moment doubt the ability of Dr. Parker as a forcible presenter of religious truth. In attractive arrangement and practical application he has few superiors. These volumes furnish us a series of expository sermons full of the most interesting material. Truth, and that often the most vivid, is found in passages which, to the ordinary reader, have little or no meaning. We say "found in;" perhaps "is connected with" would be more accurate. As a series of sermons, nothing could be more interesting; as an aid to the understanding of the Bible itself, nothing could be less satisfactory. The truths taught are the most important; and while they are, perhaps, suggested by the passage which serves as a starting-point, they cannot be said to be derived from that passage. The reader of these sermons will gain no proper idea of that part of the Bible covered by them. They belong to that class of expository sermons which, however deep in respect to the truth inculcated, are exclusively of the surface so far as concerns the exposition of Scripture.

The pity is that a man who could have done such a magnificent thing in the line of Scripture-exposition, did not do it. The work has no critical value whatever. Yet this is a characteristic which every book written on the Bible, however popular its aim, should possess. The work is to be completed in twenty-five volumes.

ANCIENT CITIES FROM THE DAWN TO THE DAYLIGHT.†

The cities described are fourteen: Ur, Nineveh, Babylon, Memphis, Alexandria, Petra, Damascus, Tyre, Athens, Rome, Samaria, Susa, Jerusalem, the New Jerusalem. In connection with each city there are gathered details of archaeology and history which present in a brief way the characteristics of that city. The author very modestly indicates his purpose: "I have neither hoped nor endeavored to do more than awaken in those whose attention has not been turned toward the subjects brought before them in these pages, an interest which may move them to seek ampler information from those who are competent to give it." In short, crisp sentences the results of modern investigation are given; and it is very difficult to see how one who reads, e. g., the chapters on Ur, Tyre and Samaria, can fail to become so interested as to be led to a more minute investigation of the subject.

* THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture, by Joseph Parker, D. D. Vol. III., Leviticus—Numbers xxvi.; Vol. IV., Numbers (continued), Deuteronomy. 8vo, pp. 360, 411. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Price: Each vol. \$1.50

† ANCIENT CITIES FROM THE DAWN TO THE DAYLIGHT. By William Burnet Wright, Pastor of the Berkely Street church, Boston. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887. 8vo, pp. 291.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Bible and the Age; or, An Elucidation of the Principles of a Consistent and Verifiable Interpretation of Scripture.* London: Unwin. '86. 8vo, pp. 420.....10s. 6d.
- Pulpit Commentary; Isaiah.* Exposition and Homiletics by G. Rawlinson. Homilies by various authors. Vol. 1. London: Kegan Paul. '86. 8vo, pp. xxxi, 579.....21s.
- Præparation zu den Psalmen mit den nötigen die Uebersetzung u. das Verständniss d. Textes erleichternden Anmerkungen.* 4 verb. Aufl. Von A. Heiligstedt. Halle: Anton. '87. 8vo, pp. iv, 120.....M.1.60
- Eden to Patmos. Scenes and Incidents in Bible History.* By Rev. S. Colthrop. 8vo.....3s. 6d.
- Biblische Archaeologie.* Hrsg. v. J. B. Warthmüller. Freiburg: Herder.....M.5.
- Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds.* 2. geheel omgewerkte uitgave. Deel I. Stuk 2. De historische boeken des Ouden Verbonds. By A. Kuenen. Leiden: P. Engels en Zoon. '87.....f.2.70
- Bible Topography.* By G. Rawlinson. London: Nisbet. '86. f2mo, pp. 142.....2s. 6d.
- Jerusalem, souvenirs d'un voyage en Terre Sainte.* By J. T. de Belloc. Paris: libr. Palmé. '86. iv, 370 p. avec grav. 1.....15fr.
- Jerusalem, Bethany and Bethlehem.* With panoramic view of Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, and 90 engravings from photographs. London: Nelson. '86. pp. 4, 168.....12s.

ARTICLES.

- The Abnath.* By Prof. J. G. Lansing in Evangelical Repository, Feb., '87.
- Difficulties in Daniel.* Christian Thought, Feb., '87.
- Analysis of the Book of Job.* By Rev. David Steele in Reformed Presbyterian Review, Feb., '87.
- About Teaching the Old Testament.* By Brooke Herford in The Unitarian, Feb., '87.
- The Cities of the Plain in Talmud and Midrashim.* By Morris Jastrow, Jr., in S. S. Times, Feb., '87.
- Where were "the Cities of the Plain?"* By Mr. Trelawney Saunders, ib.
- Human Sacrifices in Early Times.* By Prof. Francis Brown, ib., Feb. 19, '87.
- The Mission of Abraham.* By Thomas Laurie, ib.
- The Birds of Palestine.* By Dr. Selah Merrill in Independent, Feb. 10, '87.
- Semitic and Aryan.* ib., Feb. 24, '87.
- The Church of Ethiopia.* By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde in Presbyterian Review, Jan., '87.
- The Proposed School of Biblical Archaeology and Philology in the East.* By Henry W. Hulbert, ib.
- Is the Revised Version of the Old Testament better than the Authorized?* By Prof. Howard Osgood in Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. '87.
- The Moabite Stone.* By J. A. Macdonald in Knox College Monthly, Feb., '87.
- The Study of the Dead Languages.* By W. A. Hunter, ib.

The Value of Hebrew to Ministers and Students. By Prof. J. F. McCurdy, ib.

The Synthetic Pentateuch. By J. B. Thomas in National Baptist, Feb. 24, '87.

Die drei Hauptnamen des jüdischen Volkes im Neuen Testament. Von E. Hühne in Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben, Dec., '86.

L'histoire des religions. La méthode et son rôle, d'après les travaux de MM. M. Vernes, Goblet d'Alvielli et du P. Van den Gheyn. By J. Réville in Revue de l'hist. des religions, nov.-dec., '86.

Buddhismus u. Christenthum. Von Ahles in Ztschr. f. Missionsk. u. Religionswiss., Jan., '87.

Ueber die Zweckmässigkeit des theologischen Studiums der Gegenwart. Von Besser in Deutsch-evang. Blätter, Jan., '87.

Der gegenwärtige Stand der alttestam. Wissenschaft, II. Von H. Steiner in Theol. Ztschr. aus d. Schweiz.

Les Pharisiens et les gens du peuple (Am-haareç). Par M. Friedländer, Revue des études juives, juill.-sept., '86.

Recherches bibliques, VIII. Considérations supplémentaires sur le X^e chapitre de la Genèse. Par J. Halévy, ib., juill.-sept., oct.-dec., '86.

Sind die 70 Wochen in Dan. IX. 24-27 mit dem Anbruch des Neuen Testaments erfüllt oder liegt ihre endliche Erfüllung noch in der Zukunft. Von H. Kanold, Lehre u. Wehre, Dec., '86.

Die Konfiskation der hebräischen Schriften in Frankfurt a/M. in den Jahren 1509 u. 1510. Von J. Kracauer, Ztschr. f. d. Gesch. d. Juden in Deutschland.

REVIEWS.

- History of Interpretation.* Bampton Lectures, 1885. By C. J. H. Ropes in Andover Review, Feb., '87.
- Les Origines de la Bible.—La Loi I.* (Par E. Renan). In Revue des deux mondes, Dec. 1, 15, '86.
- Le code sacerdotal pendant l'exil* (Par J. Halévy). In Revue de l'hist. des Religions, sept.-oct., '86.
- Messianic Prophecy* (By Chas. A. Briggs). In Christian at Work, Feb. 10, '87; Independent, Feb. 17, '87.
- An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (By A. Kuenen). By Wm. Henry Green in Presbyterian Review, Jan., '87; Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan., '87.
- Die Theologie des Alten Testaments in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt* (Von Aug. Kayser nach des Verfassers Tode hrsg. mit einem Vorwort von Ed. Reuss). By Chas. A. Briggs in Presbyterian Review, Jan., '87.
- Hand-book of Biblical Difficulties* (By Rev. Robert Tuck, B. A.). By Willis J. Beecher, ib.
- The Book of Job, with a new Commentary* (By Benjamin Szold). By Henry P. Smith, ib.
- Nature and the Bible. Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in its relation to Natural Science* (By Dr. Fr. H. Rensch). In Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan., '87.
- Syrian Stone Lore; or the Monumental History of Palestine* (By Claude R. Conder, R. E.). In Saturday Review, Jan. 29, '87.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1887.

No. 8.

IN the statistics given in the January STUDENT touching the study of the Bible by pastors, it was stated that of those heard from not *one* had read the entire Old Testament in Hebrew. Since the publication of that statement, there have been received letters from several men,—one in Dakota, another in South Carolina, another in Michigan, and still another in Ireland,—who say that they have, with great profit to themselves, done this thing. A South Carolina pastor writes:—

“I respectfully submit my record as an instance of what a pastor *can* do if he is inclined. I have read the Old Testament in Hebrew *entirely* through. Many of the historical books, indeed most of them, I have read two or three times. Other books, such as the Minor Prophets, I have read *thoroughly*, comparing the Septuagint and Vulgate with the Hebrew. I read pen in hand, annotating, consulting commentaries, and writing out unknown words. I have tried to devote special attention to Biblical Theology and to Introduction. I have read most of the Apocrypha in Greek; the New Testament in Greek I have read fifteen or twenty times. I believe that a man who has done his duty in the college and seminary can gain a mastery of the Greek and Hebrew which will be more valuable to him than all the commentaries and works on theology put together. . . .”

A pastor's wife from Dakota thus writes concerning her husband's work:—

“We were both greatly surprised by the statement that, of one thousand ministers, not one had read the Old Testament through in the original; and while my husband's modesty on this point would perhaps prevent his writing the facts, I feel that you would be interested in knowing them. He completed the careful reading of both Old and New Testaments in the original languages in four years. The work was pursued under special difficulties, a large part of it while confined with his family in a sod shanty amid the rigors of a Minnesota winter. I know that he did the work conscientiously and faithfully, because his Hebrew Bible bears on every page the evidence of his labor. He often says that he would not exchange the benefits thus gained for his whole theological course. . . .”

ONE reason why American scholars, in some departments of science at least, must still sit at the feet of the Germans, is that

we have not yet learned the secret of independent research and original investigation. The Germans are no abler, nor are they more industrious. As regards industry, Americans are entitled to more credit than Germans. But the trouble is that, aside from our timidity, we are too often satisfied with second-hand work and second-hand authorities. Americans, for example, study commentaries on the Old Testament a great deal more than they study the Old Testament itself; they will read a dozen histories of New Testament times before thinking of Josephus or Philo or the Mishna. And yet true scholarship and truly scholarly methods of work consist in going back to the original sources of information and in drawing conclusions from the facts found there. How many students have ever made a really independent study of the Book of Genesis in the original, without placing themselves under the guidance of this or that commentary, or of this or that school of theology? Independent scholarship calls for just such a method. The object need not be to discover something in the book that no one else has found; nor does it imply the rejection of any help that the works of others may offer; it does, however, mean an independent study of the book from a healthy philological and theological stand-point. During the past years, there has been a great improvement in this regard, as can be seen from the fact that American scholarship, especially in the Old Testament department, is now being recognized and appreciated in Europe more than ever before. Americans are just as capable of doing first-rate work in the Old Testament field as are the men of any other nation. With clear ideas of the problems involved and correct methods of research, the scholarship and industry of America cannot but produce the best of results.

THE Assyrian and its contributions to biblical science have not, from the start, enjoyed the welcome elsewhere that has been so heartily accorded them by American scholars. It is quite possible that the material which this study offered to biblical apologetics, made the Bible-loving conservatives in America too ready to accept as fact what was mere theory or hypothesis. In continental circles, and especially in Germany, the opinion prevailed in many places that biblical science had caught a tartar in Assyriology. In apologetics, history and philology its contributions were either rejected or looked upon with suspicion; and the regular Old Testament men did not trust the conclusions which the Assyriologists offered. For instance, Stade, in his *Zeitschrift*, has repeatedly ridiculed the claims of this

study; in Cornill's *Ezechiel*, the attempts of Fried. Delitzsch to show the Babylonian influence on the language of that prophet, is simply discarded as unworthy of further consideration; years ago the historian Gutschmidt contended with Schrader as to the real or fictitious historical data offered by Assyriology; and a multitude of other instances of this kind could be cited. It seems, however, that the persistent and more cautious efforts of the Assyriologists are beginning to be recognized and their results accepted by Old Testament men. Professor Kautzsch, of Tuebingen, than whom there is not a more candid man among the scholars of Germany, in a recent review of Delitzsch's "Prolegomena," in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, is one of the first to offer this recognition. He says, however, that Assyriologists themselves will now acknowledge that the slow reception of their earlier efforts was not without good reason. But on the other hand, he says, it is "unjustifiable stubbornness" at the present time to reject a point simply because it is offered by Assyriology; and valuable contributions from this source to the departments of history, chronology and etymology are continually being received. On the one hand, then, the Assyriologist is becoming more careful, and is not claiming that for which he has no reasonable proof; and on the other, the theologian is becoming willing to accept what seem to be well-established results of research in this department.

It may be that the renewed interest in the biblical languages is yet to have a most important bearing upon one of the leading practical church questions of the day, namely, the union of the evangelical denominations in faith and co-operation. This study has drawn men's attention and application again to the source of all creeds and confessions, the one Word of truth. It would be too sanguine a hope to expect, even with the decided inclination of the Christianity of our day toward mutual forbearance and earnest working together, that the closest Bible-study should bring all to see eye to eye the one truth which all denominations wish to express. But a thorough and unprejudiced Bible-study will certainly do something toward this end. Men will see less of what separates them from others, and more of the great fundamental truths underlying all revelation. The thorough and general prosecution of biblical theology upon the basis of a sound study of the scriptural languages, cannot fail to benefit the church at large as well as the individual.

It must not be thought that the peculiar views of the most advanced German Old Testament students are anything new, or that

they do not hold any relation to the general theological discussions in Germany. On the contrary, the leading thesis of this school (it may not be theoretically acknowledged, but it is the practical outcome of their hypotheses,—namely, the exclusion of the divine factor from religion) stands in the closest relationship with the predominating new rationalistic school of German theologians. The leading thesis of Ritschl's school of theology is that all metaphysics must be excluded from the construction of the system of doctrines taught in the Bible, i. e., from dogmatic theology. This is done, because, as their great teacher Kant has taught them, in regard to objects not perceived by the senses, we cannot know "a thing in itself," but only its appearance and expressions. Accordingly, all that is transcendental is excluded from the domain of theological discussion. From this basis, the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement, and other fundamentals of Christian doctrine are simply eliminated from dogmatics. It is evident that rationalism, in this new garb, notwithstanding its assumed agnostic modesty, aims at a divorcement of the supernatural from Christian doctrine, and establishes its system upon the foundation of practical morality. With this general trend of negative theology, the new school of Old Testament scholars go hand-in-hand in spirit and aim. The latter is but one phase of the former. Both begin and end in a denial of the divine element in revelation.

WE know of no better illustration of the fact that a reverent and, at the same time, strictly critical study of the Word of God brings to light new truths than Professor Briggs' new work on *Messianic Prophecy*. The author, it is true, is more willing than most American scholars to accept an historical readjustment of Old Testament books or portions of books. In his latest work, however, he does not go any farther than the general consensus of conservative specialists would warrant. As regards the Pentateuch, he does not even go so far, when one takes into consideration that, notwithstanding his acceptance of a documentary theory, he regards the statements of the Pentateuch as the correct expression of the Mosaic period. And yet, when he proceeds on the basis of this restatement of the historical order of the books of the Old Testament to develop their contents and their Messianic value, it is a constant surprise to see how luminous they become when set in an historical background from which they can be rationally developed.

POPULAR USES OF THE MARGIN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISION.

BY PROF. J. F. McCURDY, PH. D.,

University College, Toronto.

Any one taking merely a hasty glance at the Revised Old Testament must be struck with the recasting which the margin has undergone. A very little reflection will bring him to the conclusion that it was worth while paying special attention to this portion of the work of revision. It may even be regarded as a great position of vantage won by the friends of accurate Bible-study that the marginal notes are now inseparably attached to the English text. Whatever may have been the advantages of circulating the Bible without note or comment, it can hardly be claimed for the world-encompassing issues of the Bible Societies, that they gave to ordinary readers a correct idea of the true state of the text of either Old or New Testament, or even an adequate reproduction of its meaning. But it has most certainly been of unspeakable benefit to the English-speaking world that the authorized version, in its complete form, did contain a liberal margin. Its use in private and in public has accustomed us to think of uncertainties, obscurities and ambiguities in connection with the text; and the way has thus been prepared for at least an unembarrassing reception of a more satisfactory popular critical apparatus. Thus all Bible-scholars, however much they may be disappointed with the execution of the task, or differ with statements here and there, yet owe a debt of gratitude to the Revisers for their manifest appreciation of the necessity of a good margin, and their scrupulous care in fixing its limits.

The advantage of having a margin of any kind is strikingly illustrated by the difference in the treatment accorded to the German and English revisions respectively. Though the work of revising Luther's Bible extended over a long series of years, and was the subject of earnest study on the part of several specialists in the history and language of the famous version, as well as on the part of the immediate Revisers, and although the changes introduced were almost ridiculously few, and unchecked currency was continued to hundreds of palpable errors endeared or supposed to be endeared to the minds and hearts of the great German race, the opposition even to the few trifling alterations was vehement and overwhelming. Why? Because, as we cannot help thinking, the people had been led to associate the idea of finality and immutability to a version which they had been accustomed to see devoid of explanations, alternative renderings, and everything that might suggest to the popular mind the idea of uncertainty or ambiguity in the original. And yet many readers of the English Bible, including some who would call themselves students, are, it is to be feared, in the habit of reading merely what is printed in the body of the text whether in the old or in the revised version. How great a mistake and loss this habit involves may be inferred from almost any page. When an alternative rendering is given, introduced by the word "or," it may be taken for granted that there was great doubt

in the minds of the majority of the Revisers as to the exact translation of the word or phrase in question. The matter at issue is often, to be sure, one merely of form or expression, but more frequently, perhaps, the decision is made between meanings entirely distinct from one another. Now, it must be remembered that no reading was introduced into the margin at all unless it had the support of a large number of the Revisers, and that a translation which was preferred by a majority of the body was in many cases placed in the margin instead of in the text, on account of the two-thirds rule as to the admissibility of changes in the text. So it appears that if the majority or even a large minority of that learned company represented, as they certainly often did, the opinions of the majority of competent outside scholars, the renderings which appear in the margin in many cases would seem properly due to the text. In other words, unless we read the margin carefully along with the text, we are often accepting and building upon words and ideas which are really not part of the Bible at all. This unfaithfulness to truth is certainly not so great a sin against the light as the habit which seems to be still prevalent of treating the old authorized version alone as the *ipsissima verba* of inspiration; but it is bad enough. Let us hope that the increasing use of the new revision, as it carries its own witness to these most important facts, may win over its readers to the true stand-point and to right practice.

A capital gain will certainly be made for true Bible-study in the incentive given by the marginal notes to the cultivation of Hebrew. The fact of the necessity for so many alternative renderings and explanatory statements would itself suggest the importance of testing the points thus raised by the only valid process of a resort to the original expressions. To take an obvious example, it is not easy to conceive how any but indolent or insensible readers can pass over Ps. XXVII. 4, or XC. 17, without a strong desire to know how it is that the divine attribute which is of supreme importance to the Psalmists, can be so doubtful to modern interpreters. In these, and in a multitude of other cases, the investigation thus incited cannot fail to be both delightful and profitable; and even if the student should ultimately decide for himself that, in these and parallel instances, what stands in the margin should be put into the text, or *vice versa*, no harm follows, but only the great gain not merely of invaluable knowledge, but of a practical training in the most valuable of all sorts of biblical criticism.

The other most important feature in the margin is also much more valuable for what it suggests than for the information it directly imparts. I mean the indication of variant readings in the original text. This is of two quite distinct kinds: references to variations in the Hebrew, or the so-called Massoretic text, whether in manuscripts or in printed editions; and the mention of divergent readings in ancient versions which are supposed to be based on recensions or copies of the original differing more or less widely from the Massoretic standard. The former class, the variations in the current traditional text, it is unnecessary to emphasize here, since they are of very slight importance, the existing manuscripts being all apparently derived from but one copy. But the references made to the readings of ancient versions, few as they are, eminently deserve attention from all students of the Bible. At the risk of seeming to utter commonplaces, I shall state a few general facts about these versions. The most important of them are the Septuagint, or Greek version, made in the third and perhaps partly in the second century, B. C., the Syriac Peshitta of the close of the second cent-

ury, A. D., and the Targums, misnamed "paraphrases," written in the West or Jewish Aramaic, of which the earliest cannot have been committed to writing before the fourth century, A. D. The Samaritan Pentateuch,—that is, the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch in Samaritan letters,—would be of the greatest value if it were accessible in its original form; but in its actual state, it is only occasionally of much importance as an independent witness to variant readings. The pre-eminent value of the Septuagint is due to its antiquity, the number of its ancient manuscripts, the fact that it seems to be the only translation from a recension of the text older than the archetype of our present standard Hebrew Bible, and to the extreme literalness of the rendering in many portions. The Peshitta, while in the main following a text very near the Massoretic, shows occasionally surprising agreement with divergent readings of the Septuagint, as well as evidence equally striking of some kind of association with the Targums beyond kinship of language.

While it would be beyond the scope of this article to discuss the question of the condition of the received Massoretic text or the chances of amending it in the light of its own manuscripts, or of the versions, it is necessary, at the same time, to remark that the whole matter of improving the Hebrew original, and thus getting a more perfect Bible, is one of extreme difficulty. The work of amending by means of a collation of manuscripts of the Massoretic text would yield results of very slight importance, on account of the fact that all copies have been propagated from the same source, and because the variations among them are few and trifling. But even these results would be difficult to attain on account of the seeming impossibility of classifying the manuscripts, the difference of opinion that prevails as to the use of traditional evidence, along with the absence of any authoritative school of textual treatment. Doctors of the Old Testament text work usually without intercommunication or mutual confidence; and those whose opinions all would defer to may be counted on the fingers of one hand. The work of emendation by means of the versions, while containing far greater possibilities, is at present and will be for a long time to come encumbered by many obstructions. Trained critics are few; a critical edition of the Septuagint is still wanting, and there is no prospect of any being soon placed in our hands; and where agreement between the manuscripts, or families of manuscripts, exists, the question as to a decision between the readings and those of the Massoretic text is often most perplexing, and not likely ever to be satisfactorily settled.

The above leading facts with regard to these vexed but important questions have been mentioned here because it is of the first importance that all readers of the Bible should know in a general way how the Book which they use has come to be what it is, and what it is that it has come to be, as far as the outward form is concerned, and also because it is well that they should not simply take the work of translation or revision on faith, but have some intelligent idea of how the Revisers have fulfilled their trust. As to the latter point it is proper to say here that the Revisers have done well in so far as they have made few changes in the *text* of the English translation based on emendations of the Hebrew, instead of the many that might have been made with much show of right. Probably the number might well have been increased; but it was better to err on the safe side, and they were bound not to go beyond the average scholarship of the time, else their work would have made no headway at all. The next revisers will work on larger and surer inductions, and will come before a much better instructed jury of

their peers; though they too, if they are to succeed in their task, must not go beyond their commission.

As to the *margin*, it must be admitted on all hands that much more numerous various readings might have been proposed there based on the testimony of the versions. It is well, however, to remember that the margin, as well as the text, was made for popular use; and there will be no dispute of the proposition that, if the margin were to be made a complete critical apparatus, it would be unmanageable, forbidding and unpopular. Personally, no doubt, nearly every scholar would prefer that the alternative renderings, or references to non-Massoretic texts, had been much more numerous. But only those who have gone over large portions of the Hebrew text, and noted strictly the divergences of the versions, can have any idea of the number of changes which might properly be proposed if completeness were to be sought.

What then is or should be the popular use of such an incomplete digest of variant textual readings? The use is great and various.

It must not be supposed that, because any effort to secure at present a complete text of the original Old Testament would be without result, it is therefore useless for us to have anything to do with the more or less diverging ancient translations. We must not forget what a version for the people should properly be, and what our revised version aims to be,—a record of the consensus of opinion of scholars on all points that are practically beyond dispute. It must, therefore, be conservative in its authoritative statements. But it may or should suggest a great deal that is new to the people, in order that they may come to the true conception of the scope and the end of study of the Bible-text. And we must not,—nay, we dare not,—rest content with an admittedly imperfect text, but ever press on towards the ideal of perfection, even though it may at present seem beyond practical reach. Moreover, it is from Bible-readers among the people that the ranks of competent scholars are to be recruited; and the greater the number of investigators, the more sure and rapid will the progress be in the elimination of doubtful and misleading, and the access of approved and consistent readings. Above all, it must be taken to heart that such work, largely technical, is not the only end at least of the popular study of the versions, which finds its account chiefly in the suggestion of fundamental and moving general ideas.

In the first place, if Bible-readers will but consider the matter well, there must be a change of sentiment with regard to what constitutes exactly the Old Testament. The very fact of the revision and the popular discussions with regard to textual variations must have awakened ordinary readers to a practical sense that the authorized version is not the real Bible; and that of itself is a great gain. But the references in the margin to the Septuagint and other versions must still further enlighten thoughtful inquirers. The questions must suggest themselves: What authority has the Septuagint, or any other ancient version? How far do these vary from the received Hebrew text? What are we really to regard as the actual form of the Old Testament? The process that leads to the answering of these inquiries may lead to temporary unsettlement of views and some dissatisfaction; but these will be followed by a greater degree of satisfaction and mental repose than could have been enjoyed before the questions were started, since there is nothing that can permanently satisfy but conclusions based on tested and attested facts. As to the main question, the essential results of the inquiry will be as follows:—The Old Testament is a body of sacred literature given to the

world in the Hebrew language; and of this literature our present Hebrew Bibles are by far the best extant representative. Yet this Hebrew text, as we now have it, is not a perfectly accurate copy in all its words or in all its sentences or paragraphs; for the Greek translation, made more than three centuries before the current Hebrew recension was authoritatively fixed, while agreeing marvelously with the latter in general, departs from it occasionally in all the above particulars. It was also based, in the main, on a good consistent text; and the departures from the Hebrew are not due to the supposed fact that the translators had our text before them and purposely changed it here and there, but to the actual fact that they had another current recension before them, which, as a rule, they rendered with scrupulous care and fidelity, and, in large portions, with extreme literalness. Other ancient versions are also deserving of attention; but they do not cause any shifting of our point of view or any new change of attitude; for they are representatives of editions which follow the original recension of our own Hebrew text. Thus, the best available Hebrew Bible would be a successful "harmony" of the original of the Septuagint and the archetype of the Hebrew Bible of our Massoretic tradition. In this way the Old Testament becomes better objectivized to us than before; our whole view of the history of its transmission is clarified and made more real; and the practical problem of textual criticism is defined.

It will, then, be readily admitted that a thoughtful and conscientious use of these marginal references must lead Bible-readers to a clearer apprehension of the character and form of the original Old Testament. Now what is the next natural consequence and practical benefit? Why, this, that students must begin to take an altogether new and direct interest in the ancient versions. The great body of those who intelligently study their Bibles will not only recognize the importance of the work of scholars who spend much time upon the ancient versions, but they will begin to think that they may yet reap some part of the benefit for themselves. Above all, the reading of the Septuagint must become more common and profitable. Indeed, the whole tendency of modern Bible-study is to push the Septuagint to the front rank as a companion-book to the Hebrew Bible. The prejudices against the Septuagint, on account of its supposed dependence upon the Hebrew when agreeing, and its assumed inaccuracy when disagreeing with the latter, are rapidly giving way; and along with this advance in critical soundness of opinion, there has come, for the relief of this noble monument of ancient learning and piety, that mighty revolution in modern taste and judgment, chiefly brought about by the science of comparative philology, through which men have been led to revolt against the exclusive domination of classical standards of literary excellence and worth, and have been brought to see and feel that the thoughts enshrined in any form of human speech are of infinitely greater moment than the style or special linguistic garb in which they are embodied. Thus, no self-respecting scholar would now plead, in extenuation of neglect of the Septuagint, that the Greek style is barbarous and repulsive. The determining question must be, Are the ancient versions worth reading on their own account, as supplementing in various ways our conceptions and knowledge of the old Hebrew Bible? The answer must come in the affirmative; and the certain consequence, sooner or later, will be that the versions will be much studied and compared. Fortunately for the progress of this branch of biblical culture, the most important of all the versions is written in Greek; and thus, even one who has no knowledge of the

Aramaic dialects can get for himself the chief benefit of this comparative study. Indeed, there does not seem to be any good reason why educated Bible-readers should not read daily a chapter or two of the Septuagint, and thus not only verify for themselves the few references made in the revised margin, but gain an insight into the genius of Old Testament style and expression, and a sense of reality and positive progress in biblical study which will prove to be quite invaluable. Not the least among the fruits of such reading and comparison will be a surer hold upon and keener appreciation of the biblical Hebrew idiom itself. What all Hebrew scholars feel in reading the Greek New Testament, with its Hebraistic syntactical coloring, will be felt much more strongly in habitual converse with the great Greek version of the Old Testament. One may thus look forward with confidence to a time not very far distant when the use of the Septuagint, in and out of our theological schools, will be as much a matter of course as the study of the Hebrew Bible, or at least that the cultivation of the former will more than keep pace with the increasing deference to the latter. It will not then have been in vain that such a scholar as Lagarde has spent the best hours of a busy life in gathering and sifting materials for a worthy text of a work which, after the neglect and depreciation of many centuries, is destined to rule in no small measure the realm of Old Testament study and research.

Such are a few of the advantages which the margin in the Revised English Old Testament is likely to bring to those who use it aright and heed its suggestions. I have purposely avoided, in this article, going into details of practical application, contenting myself with an attempt to encourage direct and sustained interest in a few broad principles of popular intelligent treatment of the two main representatives of the ancient Old Testament, the surviving text of the Hebrew original and the greatest and most ancient of the versions. With such a plan in view, minute criticism of the marginal notes is necessarily excluded. Moreover, whatever be the failures and the defects of the margin, it will be acknowledged by all who desire and labor for increasing accuracy and certitude in Bible-learning, that, if the Revisers succeed in directing more earnest attention to these great *principia* of Old Testament knowledge, such an achievement alone will be an ample vindication of the Revision.

LETTER I.—TO A PASTOR WHO WISHES TO KNOW HOW HE MAY STUDY THE BOOK OF PSALMS TO HIS OWN BEST ADVANTAGE AND THAT OF HIS CONGREGATION.

BY PROF. REVERE F. WEIDNER, D. D.,

Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

I am glad to hear that you have again taken up the study of your Hebrew Bible. The plan you speak of in your last letter of joining the Hebrew Correspondence School, and thus reviewing carefully the fundamental principles of Hebrew Grammar, is an excellent one, and I am equally pleased with your proposed project of making a special study, at suitable times, of some of the Psalms for practical use in your church services.

I sympathize with you when you speak of your many pastoral duties and your seeming want of time, but you know very well that you have not yet learned to economize time. If you determine to make a special study of the Hebrew Old Testament, and are in good earnest, you can readily reserve one hour daily for such studies. Knowing your easy disposition, I can easily understand that you think there is no time for such work, for I am certain you fritter away two hours every morning without profiting yourself or anyone else. Instead of staying in bed until seven, it would be a good plan to rise at six; and instead of spending an hour over the daily paper, suppose you devote to it only ten minutes, and you will immediately be the gainer of more time than you need, and be as wise as before.

You wish to know whether it would be advisable to lecture on the Psalms, weekly, in regular order, until they are finished. For my own part I would not do so. On the contrary, why not arrange them into little books, which can readily be done, e. g., the Penitential Psalms (VI., XXXII., XXXVIII., LI., CII., CXXX., CXLIII.), the Pilgrim Psalms (CXX.—CXXXIV.), the Messianic Psalms (II., VIII., XVI., XXII., XL., XLV., LXXII., CX.), the Hallel (CXIII.—CXVIII.), the Hallelujah Psalms (CXLVI.—CL.), the Historical Psalms (LXXXVIII., CV., CVI., CXXXV., CXXXVI.), etc., and then at special seasons or on special occasions lecture on such as are appropriate, e. g., on the Penitential Psalms before Communion, on the Messianic Psalms during the Lenten season, etc., arranging it so that in about six or eight years you can complete the whole Psalter.

You also ask my opinion about three commentaries on the Psalms which you already have in your library, and wish to know whether I can recommend anything better. As I happen to know your tastes, and since you inform me that you wish to lay a good foundation for exegetical work on the Old Testament, I shall express myself more plainly than I otherwise should. As to Spurgeon's voluminous work, of which you speak so highly as having given you such excellent hints in preparing your sermons, it does not here come into consideration. It is a book of devotion, to be placed on the same shelf with Neale¹ and Horne,²—the last com-

¹ Neale, J. M., and Littledale, R. F. *A Commentary on the Psalms from primitive and mediæval writers; and from the various office-books and hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites.* 4 vols. Third edition. London, 1874. Price, \$16.00. A devotional commentary, containing a strange medley of allegorical interpretations.

² Horne, George. *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* New York, 1865. Price, \$2.50.

mentary you ought to take up before you preach your sermon,—I hope it will not be the first you take up to prepare one.

You made a good selection when you bought the *Speaker's Commentary*,¹ edited by Canon Cook. The Commentary on the Psalms, which has also been reprinted separately, is marked by many good qualities, although it contains the notes of three different expositors. You will find that it will always repay you to examine it after you have finished your critical study of a Psalm. This commentary naturally takes its place by the side of the works of Bonar,² Murphy,³ Kay,⁴ and Fausset.⁵

I am both surprised and gratified to learn that the third commentary on the Psalms in your library is the work of Jennings and Lowe;⁶ for this book is not so well-known in this country, even by scholars, as it ought to be, and, in a certain sense, it supersedes the Commentary of Phillips.⁷ As it is especially edited for Hebrew students, and contains full and valuable introductions to each Psalm, you will find it of great service to you.

No one, therefore, can find much fault with you, in your selection of commentaries on the Psalms; for you have chosen a fair representative of each of the three classes into which commentaries may be divided.

When you inquire whether it would be desirable to procure any additional commentaries, I am in doubt what to say, for it is far better to understand one commentary thoroughly, than to misunderstand a dozen. But as you frankly state that you wish to study the Psalter critically, to get into the depths of its teachings; in fact, that you wish to train yourself as a true exegete, I cannot but answer that you ought to procure at least one, if not two, more commentaries. If you decide on buying only one, I would, without any hesitation, recommend the work of Delitzsch,⁸ who has no superior in critical acumen or in spiritual insight. But if you decide to buy two additional commentaries, I am somewhat at a loss what to recommend. I could not part with Perowne⁹, nor would I be willing to leave Moll's place vacant in Lange's series, and no true Hebraist can sleep contentedly if Hupfeld¹⁰ has been mislaid.

¹ Known also as *The Bible Commentary*. 10 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$30.00.

² Bonar, Andrew A. *Christ and His Church in the Book of Psalms*. London, 1859. New York, 1861. Price, \$2.50.

³ Murphy, J. G. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, with a new translation. Andover, 1875. Price, \$4.00.

⁴ Kay, William. *The Psalms*, translated from the Hebrew, with notes, chiefly exegetical. London, 1871. Price, \$5.00.

⁵ In Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's *Commentary*. 6 vols. Philadelphia, 1875. Price, \$15.00. Fausset's Commentary on the Psalms is also printed separately.

⁶ Jennings, A. C., and Lowe, W. H. *The Psalms with Introductions and Critical Notes*. 2 vols. London, 1875-77. Price, \$5.00.

⁷ Phillips, George. *The Psalms in Hebrew*, with a critical, exegetical and philological commentary. 2 vols. London, 1846. A second edition of this work has appeared, but I am not acquainted with it.

⁸ Delitzsch, Franz. *Biblischer Commentar ucher die Psalmen*. Fourth revised edition. Leipzig, 1883. By all means use the latest German edition. The English translation in 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1871) is based on an earlier edition.

⁹ Perowne, J. I. Stewart. *The Book of Psalms*. A new translation with introduction and notes, explanatory and critical. From third London edition. Andover, 1879. Price, \$7.50.

¹⁰ Hupfeld, H. *Die Psalmen uchersezt und ausgelegt*, von E. Riehm. Second edition. 4 vols. Gotha, 1867-72. Valuable on account of history of interpretation and philological notes, but not safe as a guide.

As to the best method of studying a Psalm, I would advise you not to examine any commentary until you are able to read the Psalm fluently in Hebrew, to translate it readily into English, and to analyze every word. Indeed, you ought not to consider that you have accomplished your task until you can take the Revised English Version in your hand and at sight translate it into the original Hebrew. This is done more easily than you imagine. You will now enjoy studying Delitzsch, which I would advise you to read first of all. Accustom yourself likewise to take notes, both grammatical and otherwise, and carefully rewrite or condense the most important hints given by other commentators, and so begin to prepare your own commentary. Such a commentary will be of more value to you than all the rest in your library, and will become fuller on each repeated study of a Psalm.

After such elaborate study of a Psalm, it will be a delight for you to present the doctrinal and practical truths therein contained to your congregation; and both you and they will be richly rewarded by your labors.

THE INCONGRUOUS CLAUSE IN GEN. XIII. 10.

BY PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, Hampden Sidney, Va.

I. ZOAR.

"And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the land of Egypt, *as thou comest unto Zoar*." The last clause seems, from its position, to qualify "the land of Egypt." But this construction deprives the statement of all meaning, inasmuch as Zoar was not in or near the land of Egypt. The clause is equally unintelligible, whether we place the pentapolis, of which Zoar was a member, at the southern or at the northern end of the Dead Sea.

Most commentators quietly ignore this difficulty. Others evade it by arbitrarily re-shaping the whole sentence. For instance, Bush¹ would connect the clause under consideration with the first part of the verse, thus, "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where, as thou comest to Zoar (before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah), even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt." This view, besides implying that the author wrote such a clumsy description that every reader must recast the whole of it to get his meaning, simply exchanges one difficulty for another. If the plain was "well watered *every-where*," as the author has just stated, why should he specify any particular portion of it? Canon Tristram, adopting the theory that now has the strongest support, locates the cities of the plain north of the Dead Sea, and would identify Zi'ara with Zoar. Zi'ara is a bold headland projecting westward from the mountains of Moab, and overlooking the Jordan valley.² But why should a place 3000 feet above the plain, and surrounded by stony ground, be mentioned as the heart of this well watered valley? The clause seems to mean that Zoar was the richest spot of all this fertile region; but the fact is that Zi'ara is not nearly so well watered as the rest of the plain. Nor can

¹ "Notes on Genesis" *in loco*.

² "The Land of Moab." H. B. Tristram. P. 343.

it be argued that the clause "as thou comest to Zoar" was intended by the author to identify the plain of which he was speaking. For that would be to define the well known by the little known. The "circuit of the Jordan" is and always has been the landmark of Palestine; whereas Zoar has always been an insignificant place. In short, it would be absurd to identify "the plain" by reference to Zoar.

Dr. Selah Merrill's reconstruction of the verse is slightly different. He makes the last clause qualify the first, throwing all the middle portion of the verse into a parenthesis, thus, "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan (that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt) until thou comest to Zoar." That is, Lot saw all the plain of Jordan as far as Zoar, which, says Merrill, was both the limit of the plain and the limit of vision in that direction.¹ But that depends upon the location of Zoar. We have seen that Tristram finds it at Zi'ara, on a mountain spur 3000 feet above the level of the valley. Conder finds it at Shaghur, in the plain of Shittim.² Merrill himself finds it at Ektanu, making a precarious argument for this identification on the ground that *Ektanu* is the Hebrew word *qatan*, which means "little," as *tsoar* also does! Now, neither his own preferred site, Ektanu, nor Shaghur, nor Zi'ara, seems to be "the limit of vision in that direction." So that Merrill's re-arrangement is as valueless as Bush's. But even if this arbitrary shifting of clauses yielded a satisfactory meaning, the question remains, How came this awkward clause to stand last in the sentence, when it was intended to modify a statement that stands first? How came this marvelously clear writer to allow four dissevering clauses to interpose between two statements whose juxtaposition was indispensable to the understanding of one of them?

Moreover, let it be observed that Gen. XIX. 22 gives the origin of the name "Zoar," the place having been called Bela before that. Hence, if we retain Zoar in Gen. XIII. 10, we involve the author in an unexplained anachronism, since he mentions a city by a name that it did not then have. The name *might* be used by anticipation, it is true; but this is highly improbable. In Gen. XIV. 2, where Bela is mentioned, an explanatory parenthesis is added, identifying Bela with Zoar, as if in view of Gen. XIX. 22. In Gen. XIV. 8, after an interval of only six verses, the same explanation is carefully inserted. Now can we believe that *in the same period* Zoar would be mentioned for the first time (Gen. XIII. 10) without any mention of Bela and without any glance at Gen. XIX. 22?

II. ZOR.

Such considerations as those above stated force us to the conclusion that "Zoar" is not the true reading in this passage. Accordingly, several careful students of biblical geography, including the Rev. Archibald Henderson³ and Dr. H. Clay Trumbull,⁴ have proposed to read "Zar" or "Zor." Mr. Henderson makes this mean the frontier fortress of Egypt. Dr. Trumbull makes it mean the border land of Eastern Lower Egypt, which was once protected by the Great

¹ "East of the Jordan." Selah Merrill. P. 233.

² "Heth and Moab." C. R. Conder. P. 150.

³ "Palestine," in the series of Hand-books for Bible-classes.

⁴ "Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for October, 1884." *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 22, 1884.

Wall extending across the isthmus from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. Either of these views is a vast advance on "Zoar;" but they also are open to serious objections. For example, "Zoar" is not the Hebrew equivalent of the Egyptian "Zor." "Zor" fails to account for the letter 'Ayin in "Zoar" (זֹאֵר). Again, the fortified country of the isthmus was not the most fertile part of the land of Egypt, and would fail utterly to meet the high requirement of the words "well watered every-where, even as the garden of Jehovah" (Gen. II. 10: "A river went out of Eden to water the garden"). Therefore, the true solution has not yet been reached, though we are undoubtedly moving in the right direction.¹

III. ZOAN.

The language "like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar" clearly implies (1) that Zoar is not the same as the land of Egypt, (2) that Zoar is in the land of Egypt, and (3) that Zoar is a definite place, a well-known town, rather than a country. Neither of the views above given meets these conditions. Now, let us retain the clauses in their true order, and read as follows: "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered every-where (before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah), even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto *Zoan*." There! How slight the change! How great the gain! "Zoar" is obviously a not unnatural error of transcription for "Zoan." See how easily one of those words can be mistaken for the other in English. The difference between them in Hebrew is even smaller, as we may see by placing them side by side,—זֹאֵן = Zoan, זֹאֵר = Zoar. It is just the difference between the two final letters ך and ר, which are not strikingly dissimilar in appearance, especially in the old writing that preceded the square character now in use. How natural, then, that a copyist, under the influence of his greater familiarity with Zoar and the apparent connection with the Jordan valley, should have written זֹאֵר for זֹאֵן. He knew where Zoar was. Probably he did not know so much about Zoan. Geography never was a strong point with the ancients. And so, whether unwittingly or of set purpose, he made the change that disjointed the description and baffled the commentators.

Having shown the *a priori* probability that *Zoan* is the true reading, let us proceed to the proof. This is no merely conjectural emendation. The Syriac version reads, "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan,

¹ Every careful reader of Dr. Trumbull's able and conclusive monograph on Kadesh Barnea must recognize the importance of the great wall of Egypt as a geographical factor. But Dr. Trumbull seems disposed to overestimate its value. Having used it as a key to unlock the mystery of Kadesh Barnea and the route of the Exodus, he would now use it to solve also the geographical problem of Gen. xiii. 10, and even Deut. xxxiv. 3. The proof that he is overworking the wall as a landmark may be found in his treatment of this last passage, Deut. xxxiv. 1-3. Here, too, instead of "Zoar" he would read "Zor," though of course the necessity for a change does not exist here, as it did in Gen. xiii. 10; and he would have Moses looking all the way from Nebo to Egypt, and that too after his eye had completed the circuit of Israel's territory. According to the text, the comprehensive view ends with "the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, at Zoar," this town being the feature of the panorama that lay immediately before and nearest to the spectator. If "Zor" be substituted, see what a line and what a boundary we get! Dr. Trumbull admits that "Zoar" is not an exact transliteration of "Zor" (much less is Zoan); and yet such is his infatuation with the wall-country (Zor) that he would have us believe that both "Zoar" in Deut. xxxiv. 3, and "Zoan" in Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43, should be read "Zor"! Less radical and violent, as well as otherwise more probable and satisfactory, is the view presented below in III., which I shall proceed at once to discuss.

that it was well watered every-where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoan." Now, the richest part of the land of Egypt was "as thou comest unto Zoan." The adjacent delta-land, "well watered every-where," was of the most exuberant fertility. Mos'oudy, the Arab historian of the tenth century, says: "The place was formerly a district which had not its equal in Egypt for fine air, fertility and wealth. Gardens, plantations of palms and other trees, vines, and cultivated fields met the eye in every direction."¹ This opinion is fully borne out by the Letter of Panbesa,² which describes "the field of Zoan" as it was in the time of Moses. "Nothing can compare with it in the Theban land and soil," says this ancient document. "It is pleasant to live in. Its fields are full of good things, and life passes in constant plenty and abundance. Its canals are rich in fish, its lakes swarm with birds, its meadows are green with vegetables, there is no end of the lentiles; melons with a taste like honey grow in the irrigated fields. Its barns are full of wheat and durra, and reach as high as heaven. Onions and sesame are in the enclosures, and the apple-tree blooms. The vine, the almond-tree and the fig-tree grow in the gardens. Plenty and abundance are perpetual in it. He rejoices who has settled there."

Assuming the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, who was so likely to make this ideal country around Zoan the standard of fertility as the man who had lived there forty years and witnessed its succession of luxuriant crops? In his narrative, Abraham and Lot had recently left this land of rivers and canals and lakes, and therefore the comparison was all the more natural. The abundant waters of the plain of Jordan, "utilized as they then were by irrigation far and wide, must have made every part of it, as seen by Abraham and Lot, a very garden of Jehovah, recalling the traditions of their own eastern Paradise, or the glorious beauty of the scene they had recently left behind them at Zoan, where the beautiful Nile, led every-where through the thirsty soil, repaid the care by a fertility and luxuriance that had passed into a proverb."³

By the change of a single letter, then, we relieve the confusion of the clauses, diminish the topographical difficulty, acquit the author of anachronistic mention of Zoar and of the folly of identifying a celebrated plain by an obscure town, gain a distinct advance in the thought instead of an interrupting check upon it, and add greatly to the force of the description by naming as the standard of comparison in point of fertility "the field of Zoan," the kernel of the land of Egypt, the richest part of the richest country in the world.

¹ Quoted in "The Story of Tanis." By Amelia B. Edwards, *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Oct., 1886.

² "Records of the Past" (vol. VI.), and Brughseh's "History of Egypt" (vol. II., pp. 100-102).

³ "Hours with the Bible." C. Geikie. Vol. I., pp. 370-3

THE WORD ELOHIM IN GENESIS I.

By PROF. R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.

In the December OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, page 116, Dr. Beecher says: "The fact that Elohim usually and Adhonay always have their verbs and adjectives in the singular is discouraging to those who seek here a polytheistic meaning." Reference is also made in the same connection to current theories of the plural Elohim.

That the word Elohim was used as a plural of excellence can never be demonstrated, nor can it ever be proved that it hints even remotely at the doctrine of the trinity. Both hypotheses are extremely improbable conjectures. The word Elohim is a Hebrew word, but it, or its equivalent, existed outside of the sphere of revelation before it existed within that sphere. Outside of this sphere it was an ordinary plural, denoting several or many gods, because the outside peoples were polytheistic and had use for just such a term to express what they regarded as the prominent divine element inhering in more than one god. When the word was brought within the sphere of the religion of Israel, its plural form was brought with it, and in this form it was applied to the one true God, but it was not applied to him as a suggestion either of majesty or trinity. So remote and metaphysical a hint of the transcendent excellence, or the triune personality of God, would have been of no practical value to anyone, except, perhaps, to those already informed of these things by a supernatural revelation. The idea of majesty or trinity is not the idea that would naturally be attached to the plural term. When it was brought within the sphere of revelation and used in its plural form to designate the one true God, it was done because there was no other generally understood name by which to call him. Elohim really has no singular form. El (or Eloah) denotes, not one god, but one among many gods, in so far as it designates an individual at all. Had the writer of Gen. I. said, "In the beginning El created the heaven and the earth," the statement would have been as polytheistic as it is in the present case, perhaps even more so. It would have meant that one among the many gods did it; and the ancient Hebrew might have asked, "Which one of them did it, Ra, or Osiris, or Baal, or Chemosh?" and so on through the list. And he actually did ask it, even though no term of the singular number was here used. The doctrine that there is only one God was lost and found again. At the time when Genesis is generally supposed to have been written, it was in process of being found. The new revelations had to coin new words and adapt old ones, as well as it might, just as Christianity had to do in the case of the Greek language. In order that the recipients of the new revelations might eventually no longer doubt that there is only one God, expedients had to be resorted to. The use of no one term, whether of the singular or plural form, would settle the question. One of these expedients, we may suppose, was a syntactical one—the use of the singular verb, or of the definite article, with Elohim; perhaps another was the invention, or at any rate the adoption, of a new memorial name by which the true God should ever afterward be distinguished; perhaps another was a course of experimental

tests—Jehovah permitting himself, so to speak, to be brought into collision with the so-called gods of the nations, in order that the Hebrews might have sensible proof of his superiority and, finally, of the nothingness of the other gods. The biblical revelation, of course, always insists on a rigid monotheism; and the very fact that it does this so strenuously, even in its earliest stages, seems to imply that monotheism was not the prevailing belief at that time. Here and there a pre-Mosaic saint, like Abraham, may have been a monotheist. But it is a noticeable fact that in his appearances to Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and the Israelites, Jehovah was accustomed to introduce himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, “the God of thy fathers,” “the God which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,” thus enabling those to whom he appeared to identify him, instead of mistaking him for some other god. The term Elohim was originally polytheistic, a simple ordinary plural, and not a metaphysical one. But when the Hebrew language came to be used as the vehicle of revelation, a new meaning was gradually given this word just as new meanings were given many others. But if a polytheistic Egyptian, or Canaanite, familiar with the Hebrew language, had read the first verse of Genesis, he would probably have understood it in a polytheistic sense, unless the singular verb with which Elohim is construed had been suggestive to him of something more than bad syntax. It seems to me, therefore, that so far as the use of the plural Elohim in Gen. 1., and other passages, is concerned, we can infer nothing whatever concerning the polytheistic or monotheistic nature of the religion of Israel. The fact appears to be that the *religion* was monotheistic, while the *people* were polytheistic, at least for a long while. “Jehovah, he is God; there is none else beside him,” was a truth which they did not learn in a day.

Nor do I think that the plural expression “we will make,” in verse 26, hints at any degree of polytheism within the sphere of revelation; nor does it contain a suggestion of the trinity or of majesty. As in the case of Elohim, so remote and vague a suggestion of the trinity could not have been distinguished at that early day from polytheism—the very error against which it was so earnestly desired to protect Israel. It may suggest the trinity to us, but it could not have done so to the first readers of the passage, and this latter is the main point. And as for the royal “we,” aside from the fact that such a use of the pronoun is extremely rare in the Old Testament, and perhaps altogether unknown to the writer of Genesis, the pronoun “I,” when God speaks, is vastly more royal than “we.” How would it do to substitute “we” for “I” in this passage: “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?” and in other similar ones? It would not do at all. The expression under consideration is a quotation. If the author had been using the indirect style of discourse, he might have written, “And God said that he would make man,” using the singular instead of the plural verb. But he puts words into the mouth of God, still using the word Elohim in the singular sense, as he had done in the preceding instances. Elohim, with him, is still one, and the only one. I conceive that he quotes him here as saying “*We will make*,” because in the revelation-vision (whether poetical or real) Elohim was represented to him as addressing the intelligent and holy beings whom he had already created. Doubtless these had witnessed with great joy and expressions of praise the creative acts just described, and now Elohim by way of loving concession, as a father to his children, says to them: “We will now make man in the same image and likeness as you and I are. He also shall be one of the sons of God.”

Nor does this view at all require that we should go to the extreme of ancient Jewish vagaries in regard to angelic co-operation with God in the work of creation, though it postulates the generally admitted fact that the existence of angelic beings was recognized in the earliest ages even where there had been no direct supernatural revelation on the subject.

This exegesis may be wrong; but it is respectfully submitted. It is not polytheistic, and it violates no known facts in the case, nor does it involve a metaphysical and unhistorical presupposition of the doctrine of the trinity, or of the so-called *pluralis majestatis*.

THE CAPHTORIM.

WHO WERE THESE PEOPLE AND WHERE WAS THEIR ORIGINAL HOME?

BY REV. A. HALLEN,

The Caphtorim are mentioned in the Old Testament in Deut. II. 23, and Gen. X. 4. Caphtor is found in Deut. II. 23; Jer. XLVII. 4, and Amos IX. 7. According to Deut. II. 23, the Caphtorim came forth from Caphtor, destroyed the Avvim, who dwelt along the southern sea-coast of Palestine, and occupied their country. The usual name for this people in the Old Testament is Philistines. In harmony with this it is said in Amos IX. 7, that Jehovah brought the Philistines up from Caphtor, as he brought Israel from Egypt; and Jeremiah calls the Philistines the "remnant of the isle (or sea-coast) of Caphtor."

Four different countries have been regarded as the Caphtor of the Bible:

1) Cappadocia. This view is supported by the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version and the Targums. The only reason that led these ancient versions to render Caphtor Cappadocia was probably the similarity in sound between the two names. But even this support fails when we learn that the ancient name of Cappadocia was Catpatuk.

2) Cyprus. Against this identification speaks the fact that Cyprus, in the Old Testament, is called Chittim, which by no means resembles Caphtor.

3) Crete. Many considerations favor this view. In Zeph. II. 5, and Ezek. XXV. 16, the Philistines are identified with the Cherethim; and in 1 Sam. XXX. 14, the land of the Philistines, or at least a part of it, is called "the South of the Cherethim." Cherethim is probably the Hebrew word for Cretans, and the Septuagint renders it Κρηται in Ezek. XXV. 16, and Zeph. II. 5. Caphtor is called an island by Jeremiah. Greek and Roman writers also favor this supposition. Stephanus relates that Gaza, the chief city of the Philistines, was called Minoa, after the Cretan sea-king Minos, who came there with his brothers Aeakos and Rhadamantos, and named the place after himself. Tacitus, mistaking the Jews for the Philistines, states that they left Crete and settled on the extreme border of Lybia.

On the other hand, there are some strong objections to this identification. In Gen. X. 13, 14, the Caphtorim are classed as belonging to Egypt, and Crete is too far removed from that country to be counted as belonging to it. The Philistines are said, verse 14, to have come forth from the territory of the Casluhim, which is generally admitted to be Casiotis, or the country between the Delta of the

Nile and Palestine. It also seems improbable that the Caphtorim should come by water from distant Crete and be able to destroy the powerful Avvim and take their country, or that the Phœnicians would allow another sea-faring people to settle in their immediate vicinity.

4) The Delta of the Nile.

We regard this solution of the problem as the true one. The genealogical table in the tenth chapter of Genesis, which really is geographical and ethnographical, places the Caphtorim among the descendants of Mizraim, and we must therefore seek for their home somewhere in Egypt. The same table further states that the Philistines came from the territory of the Casluhim, which, as already has been said, belonged to Egypt. This, however, seems to contradict the fact that they came from Caphtor. Some scholars have therefore thought that the relative clause in verse 14 has been misplaced and that the passage should read "Caphtorim, whence went forth the Philistines." That such a mistake has been made is possible, but hardly probable, as the parallel passage in 1 Chron. i. 12, has the same reading as Gen. x. 13, 14. A more acceptable explanation may be given. When the Philistines left the Delta they passed through Casiotis, and perhaps stayed there for a while, and when they entered Palestine they actually came forth from the land of the Casluhim. The comparative ease with which a strong people might enter the country of the Avvim in this way and expel or destroy its inhabitants must also be taken into consideration.

Ebers has shown in his "Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's" that the Delta was called by the Egyptians "kaft" or "kaft-ur" (great kaft). As it was a sea-coast, or almost an island, it was also called by its Phœnician settlers "Ai-kaft," Ai (*N) meaning *sea-coast* or *island* and kaft *curved* or *bent*, from a Hebrew root *kaphath* which also is found in Egyptian. Ai-kaft then means *the curved sea-coast*, which is a fitting name for the land about the mouths of the Nile. This name is similar to the Greek *Αι-γυπτος*, which the Greeks probably derived from it through the Phœnicians.

But whence came the inhabitants of the Delta? They were not Egyptians. These latter first settled in Upper Egypt and then pushed gradually northward. The Delta was occupied by Phœnicians. This sea-faring people very early became acquainted with the unoccupied coast of Lower Egypt, and began to settle there. They founded the maritime towns of Tanis and Herakleapolis-parva. As they increased in number they moved southward, came in contact with the Egyptians and gradually adopted their culture. They preserved their independence, and their kings reigned as cotemporary dynasties (the ninth and tenth) during the reign of the sixth, seventh and eighth dynasties. In the time of the 12th dynasty, Semitic families were seeking admittance also in Upper Egypt, as is seen from monuments belonging to that time. That there was close intercourse between Phœnicia and Egypt is proved by the fact that the Phœnicians very early got their alphabet from the Egyptian hieratical characters. It was then simplified, and became the basis of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets. This derivation of the Phœnician alphabet from the complicated hieratical characters could hardly have taken place if the two peoples had not lived together in Egypt. Monuments in Phœnicia and Egypt testify of intercourse between the two countries. Phœnicia itself was called "kaft" or "kafatha," as the table of Kanopus shows, where in the Greek translation "kaft" is rendered *φοινίκης*. The name of the colony had been transferred to the mother country.

During the thirteenth dynasty there was a great influx of Semites who finally overpowered the legitimate kings and reigned under the name of Hyksos in Lower Egypt for 500 years, or from about 2150 till about 1650 B. C. During this time the Israelites came down to Egypt and were well received by the kindred rulers of the country. The legitimate kings, who had withdrawn to Upper Egypt, at last succeeded in expelling the intruders, and most of them returned to Asia. A part of the Caphtorim probably left Egypt at the same time, passed through the territory of the Casluhim, occupied the southern coast of Palestine, and became almost neighbors to their Phœnician ancestors. At the time of the exodus the Philistines were already settled in their country and were very powerful, as is seen from Exod. XIII. 17. According to Gen. XX. 21, 26, the Philistines dwelt in Gerar as early as the time of Abraham and Isaac. This would imply that already at that time some Philistines had settled there, coming either from Caphtorim or Phœnicia. The inhabitants of that region may, however, be called Philistines, not because they really were so, but because they inhabited a country which afterwards was called Philistia.

The Phœnicians had colonies not only in Egypt, but also in Asia Minor, the islands of the Ægean Sea, Crete, Italy and Africa. There were probably settlers in Crete both from Phœnicia and Lower Egypt, and these kept up intercourse with their former homes. When the Hyksos were expelled a part of the Caphtorim may have removed to Crete, and when later they were pressed by the Greeks they may have joined their brethren who had already found a home in Palestine. Thus the previously mentioned identification of the Philistines with the Cretans may be explained.

The Phœnicians, and therefore the settlers in the Delta, and the Philistines were, as has already been suggested, Semites. This is proved by their language and religion. The Phœnician language, as found on monuments and coins, is closely allied to the Hebrew, and so is the remnant of the Philistine tongue that is preserved in the names of kings and cities mentioned in the Old Testament. It is also evident that the Hebrews found no difficulty in understanding their Philistine neighbors. Both the Phœnicians and the Philistines worshiped the old Semitic gods, Baal and Astarte. We feel, therefore, safe in affirming that they were Semitic peoples. In the Bible division of mankind, however, they are placed among the Hamites. But that division is not altogether based on real race distinctions. The ancients did not possess our means and ability of tracing the affinities of the different nations, but divided them more according to their civilization and usages than according to their origin. The Phœnicians and Philistines therefore were classed as belonging to a family entirely different from the Hebrews. A true classification would, no doubt, designate at least a part of the Hamites, and perhaps all of them, as a branch of the Semites which had attained to a civilization different from that of their other Semitic brethren.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

APRIL 10. JOSEPH EXALTED. Gen. xli. 33-48.

APRIL 17. JOSEPH MAKES HIMSELF KNOWN. Gen. xlv. 1-15.

APRIL 24. JOSEPH AND HIS FATHER. Gen. xlvii. 1-12.

MAY 1. ISRAEL IN EGYPT. Exod. i. 6-14.

MAY 8. THE CHILD MOSES. Exod. ii. 1-10.

The one common subject of these five lessons is Israel in Egypt. If the account of the descent of the Israelite people into Egypt, and their residence there, is to be regarded as historical, it must be understood consistently with itself, and with the other known facts in the case. This is a self-evident principle of interpretation, but one which is not in all particulars followed in our received traditional understanding of this part of the Bible. For fifteen centuries preceding the one in which we live, the interpretation of the Old Testament has descended to us through a succession of men who paid little attention to the geography of the countries where the events occurred, who were entirely without the helps which recent investigations have brought to light, and who were actuated by a disposition to make the Bible stories as wonderful as possible. Most of us received the stories, with this interpretation put upon them, when we were little children; we bring our imperfect childish conception of the matter into our present understanding of it. In the circumstances, none of us should be surprised if, on reviewing the evidence, we find that we have been accustomed to suppose that the Bible teaches some things which it clearly does not teach, concerning these events. These considerations are especially important just now, because many who deny the credibility of the facts stated in the Bible, really base their denials quite as much on what the Bible is commonly supposed to mean, as on what the Bible says.

In Gen. xlvi., Exod. i., vi., is a list of "all the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt" (Gen. xlvi. 26). The question of the ages of these persons is of some importance in itself, and of more importance for the light it throws on other matters. Jacob was 130 years old when he came to Egypt, Gen. xlvii. 9. Joseph was then thirty-nine (Gen. xli. 46, 53; xlv. 11). It follows that Jacob was ninety-one years old when Joseph was born, and ninety-seven years old when he returned to Canaan. If we suppose the interval between Jacob's service for his wives and that for his cattle, Gen. xxxi. 41, etc., to have been twenty years, Reuben, Joseph's oldest brother, may have been twenty-six years older than himself, that is, may have been about sixty-five years old at the descent to Egypt. Evidently, the older sons of Jacob were old enough to have children and grandchildren of their own. On the other hand, within the thirty-three years after Jacob's return, there had occurred the marriage of Judah, the births of the three sons of that marriage, the successive marriages and deaths of the two elder sons, then an interval of some years, and after that the births of Pharez and Zerah, Gen. xxxviii. It follows that the latter must have been very little boys, at the time of the going down into Egypt, and that Hezron and Hamul, Gen. xlvi. 12,

were born some years later. Further, Benjamin was born after Jacob returned to Canaan, Gen. XXXV. 18. Hence his ten sons, Gen. XLVI. 21, if they were all born before the descent into Egypt, must have been young boys at that time, and probably from more mothers than one. Again, Joseph was twenty-eight years old at the time of the dreams of the chief butler and chief baker, Gen. XLI. 46, 1. He had then been for a considerable time in prison, and had previously for a long time been Potiphar's overseer, Gen. XXXIX. 5, 6, and had before that had time to make the reputation that led to his appointment. From these instances it appears that Jacob's sons and grandsons were old enough to marry, to have families, to do a man's work in the world, when they were not much more than twenty years of age. This confirms the position heretofore taken in these notes, that the extreme ages reached by the patriarchs indicate, not that human life then had a longer average than in subsequent times, but rather that the stock whence Israel sprang was apt occasionally to produce men of extraordinary vigor and length of life.

Were the seventy "souls," a few of them not yet born, with the addition of the wives of Jacob's sons, all the persons who came into Egypt with Jacob? This, I believe, is commonly asserted; but is it what the writer of the list intended us to understand? Are we to understand that among all Jacob's grandchildren there was but one girl? See Gen. XLVI. 17, 7. In view of the early marriages of Benjamin and Joseph and Er, are we to hold that, previous to the descent into Egypt, none of Jacob's sons possessed grandchildren? Further, who are Jacob's daughters, mentioned in Gen. XXXVII. 35; XLVI. 7, and in the latter place expressly distinguished from his sons' daughters? Further still, does this author mean that, when they went to Egypt, they abandoned their numerous servants and retainers?

When Abraham pursued the four kings, he could equip 318 men from among those of his home-born dependants who were available for a sudden emergency, Gen. XIV. 14. Several times afterward, the clan of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is represented as increasing, and never as diminishing, e. g., Gen. XXVI. 16, etc. It is represented that Jacob brought a large re-enforcement from Padan-aram, XXX. 43; XXXI. 16; XXXII. 10; XXXVI. 7, etc. Two only of his ten adult sons had a force sufficient for the capture of Shechem, XXXIV. 25. When the family came into Egypt, they came with their cattle and their goods, XLVI. 6. What became of their servants and retainers? Nothing is said concerning them; the traditional interpretation therefore concludes that the author of Genesis held that there were no servants or retainers of Jacob who came into Egypt—nobody at all except the sixty-seven persons who are named, and the wives of Jacob's sons. Is this a just conclusion?

When we speak of Jacob's sons buying corn in Egypt, I am afraid that the average picture in the minds of Christian people is that of just ten men, leading or riding just ten donkeys, buying so much corn as the ten donkeys could carry, and carrying home their purchase with them. I am afraid that I should be accused of caviling, if I should ask how long it would take the ten heavily loaded donkeys to go from the capital of Egypt to Beer-sheba, or how much corn would be left, after furnishing subsistence for the caravan by the way. If any of us have this idea of the matter, then certainly we need to modify it. Let us modify it not by conjecturally throwing in a few extra donkeys, but by looking at the facts. Unless the clans of Isaac and Jacob had unaccountably dwindled within

a few years, the purchase must have been of a grain-supply for some thousands of people. Egypt at that time possessed systems of transportation both by land and water. The grain business was a monopoly, conducted by Joseph for the king; but the grain was stored in cities in various parts of Egypt, *xli. 48*. In the circumstances, we must think of the ten men riding their asses, their purchase-money with them, making the most respectable show they were able, going to the headquarters for grain-sales, where Joseph was, and transacting their business; the grain itself would naturally be delivered from the most convenient store-city, and by the most convenient transportation, to some place where Jacob's men would meet it with a caravan sufficient for transporting it home.

If we altogether understood the principles on which the genealogies found in the Bible are written, we should doubtless be able to explain just how the seventy "ancestral heads" mentioned in the list are to be distinguished from all other persons; that would carry with it the explanation of the fact that the writers of the Old and New Testaments habitually think of these seventy as properly constituting the Israel that went into Egypt. But if they thought of this fact as historical, they certainly did not understand it as conflicting with the other fact that seems to be so clearly implied in the narrative, namely, that Jacob took to Egypt the whole body of his servants and retainers. It seems to follow that these dependants, since they were mainly of the same race with himself, and were all included in the covenant of circumcision, became gradually blended, while in Egypt, with the blood-kindred of Jacob, so that all alike were reckoned Israelites. As Esau had already become the head and "father" of a strong people, made up largely of the kindred of his wives and their tribesmen, so each of the immediate descendants of Jacob became the ancestral head of a tribe, or a family, not made up exclusively of his lineal descendants, but including others who, for various reasons, came to be identified with that particular division of Israel.

The cases of Simeon, Judah and Joseph, *Gen. xlv. 10, 12, 27*, and parallel passages, show that Canaanite or Egyptian blood might be admitted into the Israelite lines of descent. To what extent the Israel that went into Egypt may have there received additions through intermarriages with other peoples, or by adoptions from other peoples, no one is qualified to say; but the circumstances were such as afforded peculiar facilities for growth of this sort.

The duration of the sojourn is described in the Bible in the following forms: Exactly 430 years, *Exod. xii. 40, 41*; 430 years, "in Egypt and in the land of Canaan," *Sept. ibid.*; 430 years, beginning with the date when the covenant was made with Abraham, *Gal. iii. 17*; 400 years, *Gen. xv. 13*, *Acts vii. 6*; the fourth generation, *Gen. xv. 16*. In the tribe of Levi, the names of Levi, Kohath, Amram, Aaron span the time of the sojourn; in some of the other tribes, the generations are more numerous. In the *Sunday School Times* of Jan. 29, 1887, Prof. W. H. Green says that, according to *1 Chron. vii. 23-27*, Joshua is tenth in descent from Jacob. Supposing this to be correct (the list in *Chronicles* is of uncertain interpretation), and supposing the sojourn in Egypt to have been the 215 years that the Septuagint and St. Paul make it to be, there is room for the entire succession, without supposing any father to have been less than 22 years old at the birth of his eldest son. Certainly all the biblical evidence fits this view of the case, and does not so well fit any other. There has been a disposition among interpreters to stretch the time as much as possible, in order to give time

enough for Israel to multiply to the 600,000 fighting men of the times of the Exodus; but what has been said above as to the number who went into Egypt, and the possibility of increase by absorption, shows that no stretching of this sort is necessary.

The tradition handed down through Syncellus is that the Pharaoh of Joseph was the last of the Shepherd Kings, the last king of the seventeenth dynasty. Between the accession of this king and that of Menephthah, who is commonly regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, the numbers given in Rawlinson make it to have been a period of about 360 years, but with some gaps to be filled, and some doubtful passages to be adjusted. But it is hardly possible that this Pharaoh was one of the Shepherd Kings, Gen. XLVI. 34. A period of 215 years before the Exodus would begin somewhere in the middle years of the famous Thotmes III., perhaps just before he entered upon the expeditions in which he devastated Palestine and Syria. This cast of the dates seems to me much more likely than the other. So great a conqueror as Thotmes needed a man of Joseph's ability at home, to look after his affairs, and keep him from bankrupting his kingdom.

On any theory of the chronology, while Israel was safe and increasing in Egypt, Canaan, the land of their sojournings, was being crossed and recrossed by the armies that carried on the wars of the various Pharaohs. Rameses I., the founder of the nineteenth dynasty, reigned but one year, or a little more. He was succeeded by Seti, who reigned thirty years or more, but who, after twelve years, associated with himself his son, afterward the distinguished Rameses II., at that time a young boy. If common opinion is correct, the foster-mother of Moses was a daughter of either Rameses I. or of Seti. As Rameses II. reigned sixty-seven years, and Moses was eighty years old at some time during the early part of the reign of his successor, Moses and Rameses must have been nearly of an age; as boys, we may fancy that they played and studied together. The policy for oppressing the Israelites began pretty promptly upon the accession of this dynasty. Perhaps the flight of Moses from Egypt occurred not very long after Rameses II. became sole king. In view of these facts, if the Sunday-school publishers of the month do not make a somewhat conspicuous use of the hideous recently unrolled mummy of this Rameses, they will prove themselves unaccountably neglectful of their opportunities.

Josephus (*Ant.*, II., x, xi) tells some wonderful stories concerning the childhood and early manhood of Moses, which he did not obtain from the Scriptures. Probably they come from some work of the Jewish imagination, written in the centuries just before Christ; but the writer knew enough of Egyptian history, as we have now learned it from the monuments, to make some correct points, at least, in the setting in which he has placed his stories; there were Ethiopian wars, for example, at the time assigned to them by the story in Josephus.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

The May number of *THE STUDENT* will contain a "book-study" of Hosea by Prof. Francis B. Denio, of the Bangor Theological Seminary.

A professorship of the Semitic languages has recently been established in the University of Rio de Janiero, and a professor appointed by command of Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil.

Prof. D. Kauffman, of Buda-Pesth, and Dr. A. Berliner, of Berlin, will both publish, in the near future, monographs in reply to the attack made on Judah Halevi's poetry and on the late Leopold Zunz by Professor de Lagarde.

The *Knox College* (Toronto) *Monthly* for February contains five contributed articles. The subjects of three of these articles are, "The Moabite Stone," "The Study of the Dead Languages," "The Value of Hebrew to Ministers and Students." The time, it would seem, has come when college-papers shall discuss Old Testament and Semitic topics. This indicates at least two things,—that there is an increased and increasing interest in such subjects; and that the influence of someone is being felt by those connected with the college. Knox College is to be congratulated upon having in its faculty the Rev. J. F. McCurdy, Ph. D.

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. have in press *Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt*, the Stone Lectures for 1887, delivered at Princeton by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D. The author has for several years made a special study of Egyptology in its bearings on the Old Testament. The first two lectures deal with the Egyptian and Hebrew chronologies. Lecture III. takes up Joseph in Egypt; IV. Abraham and Moses; V. discusses the place of the Exodus in Egypt's history; VI. "The Pharaoh of the Exodus." Besides numerous notes, references, etc., there is also added a chronological chart which shows at a glance the two chronologies. In an appendix the author will discuss the question whether the name "Hebrews occurs on the monuments."

The Chautauqua Hebrew work will be conducted this year as before, except that it will not be under the name of the American Institute of Hebrew. The same advantages will be offered at this school as at the schools of the Institute. It will open July 10th, and continue four weeks. Its corps of instructors will include Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine, D. D., of Oberlin, O., Prof. David G. Lyon, Ph. D., of Cambridge, Mass., Prof. Wm. R. Harper, Ph. D., of New Haven, Conn., Prof. D. A. McClenahan, M. A., of Allegheny, Pa., and Prof. R. D. Wilson, Ph. D., of Allegheny, Pa. Instruction will be given not only in Hebrew, but also in the cognates. The classes in Assyrian, under the instruction of America's pioneer Assyriologist, will be particularly attractive.

The American Institute of Hebrew will conduct four Summer Schools of Hebrew during the coming summer. These will be held at Philadelphia (June 16—July 15), at Newton Centre, Mass. (June 30—July 29), at the University of Virginia (July 28—Aug. 26), at Evanston, Ill. (Aug. 4—Sept. 2). Two important items in connection with this announcement are, (1) the change of the location of the Chicago School from Morgan Park, where it has been held for five years, to Evanston, the seat of the North-Western University, with which is connected the Garrett Biblical Institute; and (2) the fact that in the Schools of 1887 *no tuition-fee will be charged*. Arrangements of such a nature have been completed that for about *twenty dollars*, exclusive of traveling expenses, one can spend a month in a most pleasant and profitable work.

One of the most necessary yet one of the most difficult things to be done by conscientious students of the Old Testament is the separation of the purely literary questions of the Old Testament from the superstructure of false hypotheses that has been erected on these literary discussions. The question, for example, as to the literary analysis of Genesis, or even of the whole Pentateuch, is one that should be decided independently, without taking into account the further problems of the authorship of the Pentateuch and its position in the development of Old Testament religion. Unfortunately this is not always kept in mind, and accordingly some accept the errors of the one department on account of the truths in the other, and others reject the truths in the one on account of the errors in the other. The great trouble with our analysts is that they cannot acknowledge a limit to their knowledge, and think that, having settled with a comparative unanimity a division of the Pentateuch into documents, they must, at all hazards, build up a general scheme of religious development on the basis of their literary analysis.

Rev. F. A. Klein, the discoverer of the *Mesa-stone*, who is now in Germany, but who for the past twenty-six years has been a Protestant missionary in Palestine (five in Nazareth, and twenty-one in Jerusalem), says that the present population of the Holy Land is divided into three parts,—the city people, the village or country people, and the Bedawins. The first are called *madani*, pl. *madaniye*; the second *fellah*, pl. *fellahin*; the third, *bedawi*, or inhabitants of the desert. The last named often call themselves simply *el-arab*, the Arabs *par excellence*. These three classes are sharply distinguished from each other by their language, their clothing, the shape and arrangement of their houses, and their general customs and manner of living. The *fellahin* are considered the lowest in the land, and the word *fellah* is often used in derision. The inhabitants of the cities imitate the ways of western civilization, and pity the poor peasants. The latter, in turn, are the object of the supreme contempt of the Bedawins. Rev. Klein gives a most graphic and instructive description of the manners and customs of the *fellahin* in the *Journal of the German Palestine Society*, vol. III.

In one department of Old Testament study, the older generations of scholars were far in advance of the present. We refer to the study of the post-biblical Hebrew, as this appears in the Mishna, Talmuds, Midrashim and Targums. This

bears the same relation to the biblical Hebrew that the modern Greek does to the ancient. Indeed, its relative importance for the study of biblical Hebrew is much greater. In the days of the Buxtorfs, Christian scholars were thoroughly at home in this field. At the present date, those who can find their bearings in it are few and far between. At the head of these few stands the venerable Prof. Franz Delitzsch, of Leipzig, whose work in this department, however, falls mostly in his younger days. The most energetic Christian scholar in this field now is Lic. Dr. Aug. Wünsche, who has translated into German a collection of old Midrashim, and has published them in thirty-four pamphlets in the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, and who has just issued the first half of a translation of the Haggadic portions of the Babylonian Talmud. Professor Strack, of Berlin, is also thoroughly at home in this field, and in connection with Professor Siegfried, of Jena, has published a short grammar of post-biblical Hebrew. The *Instituta Judaica*, established within the past few years at nine German universities, are devoting much time and attention to the literature.

The current number of *Hebraica* is one of the most interesting and instructive that has as yet been published. The opening article is by Rev. Philip A. Nordell, "On the Synonyms 'Adhah (עֲדָה) and Qahal (קָהָל).'" These synonyms are treated in a scholarly manner in the light of all the Old Testament texts in which they occur, and the author comes to the conclusion that "the 'adhath Israel was the technical name of the whole body of circumcised males above twenty years of age, who either represented all the people, or were represented by the heads of their respective families," and that "the qahal was, in general, the name of any theocratic gathering of the people, and was composed of those who freely responded to a summons proceeding directly or indirectly from Israel's divine king." Richard J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., follows with a *critique* of Kotték's "Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum." Perhaps the most interesting to Hebrew scholars is the article by Dr. Chas. A. Briggs on "The Strophical Organization of Hebrew Trimeters." The subject is treated at great length, and the article will undoubtedly cause much discussion among scholars. Robert F. Harper, Ph. D., gives eight pages of corrections (photo-engraved) to the Cyls. A and B of the Esarhaddon inscriptions as published in I. and III. Rawlinson. The Rev. F. J. X. O'Connor, S. J., gives a photo-engraved page showing the variations between the Nebuchadnezzar inscription in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, and an unpublished inscription of the same king in the British Museum. In addition, a list of the various inscriptions of this king is added. "The Jewish Grammarians of the Middle Ages" are treated by Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph. D.; and notes on Mabbul (מַבּוּל), N'philim (נִפְלִיִּים), etc., are given by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D. D.

▷BOOK NOTICES.<

ORIENT.*

In the first of a series of five lectures published in this book, Dr. Cook discusses Palestine, Egypt and the future of Islam. The lectures contain some most admirable word-painting. "God in history in Palestine," "Palestine a bridge between Egypt and Assyria," "Possible future of Syria," "The future of Mohammedanism" are a few of the points taken up. Other lectures follow on "Advanced thought in India," "Keshub Chunder Sen and Hindu theism," "Woman's work for women in India," "Japan, the self-reformed Hermit nation," "Australia, the Pacific Ocean, and International Reform."

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.†

Of this volume, sixty-eight pages are given to the Old Testament, forty-five pages to the New Testament, eighty-six pages to Historic Theology, sixty-three pages to Systematic Theology, fifty-four pages to Practical Theology. It is in the first department that we are particularly interested.

The first chapter treats of "Semitic Studies" in general, in which reference is made to the development of this work in America. The second treats of "Old Testament Introduction," in which a brief survey of Wellhausen's theory of the Pentateuch is presented, together with notices of recent books by Green, Bissell and Vos, in support of the Mosaic authorship, and of recent works by conservative German scholars. The leading German scholars are classified as follows: (1) Supporters of the post-exilic codification of the Priest's Code (the Wellhausen or Grafian hypothesis) are Budde, of Bonn; Stade, of Giessen; Duhm and H. Schultz, of Göttingen; Giesebrecht, of Greifswald; Kneucker, of Heidelberg; Siegfried, of Jena; Delitzsch, Guthe and König, of Leipzig; Cornill, of Marburg; Kayser (d. 1885), Nowack and Reuss, of Strassburg; Kautzsch, of Tübingen; Smend, of Basel; Vuilleumeir, of Lausanne; Steiner, of Zürich. (2) Supporters of the Priest's Code as an older document are: Dillmann and Strack, of Berlin; Köhler, of Erlangen; Bredenkamp, of Greifswald; Klostermann (?), of Kiel; Mühlau and Volek, of Dorpat. (3) Critics who mediate between the two schools are: Kamphausen, of Bonn; Ryssel (?), of Leipzig; Baudissin, of Marburg. Only *one* Old Testament professor in Germany, Bachmann, defends the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But, as Prof. Curtiss remarks, "this is not a question to be settled by votes." The third chapter is given to "Hermeneutics," and the fourth to "Old Testament Theology," in which general

* ORIENT. With Preludes on Current Events. By Joseph Cook. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 8vo, pp. 340. Price, \$1.50.

† CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. IV. Pp. 336. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. Price, \$1.50.

questions relating to this study are discussed. The spirit of this presentation and its execution, are all that could be desired in view of the small amount of space at the disposal of the author. There are not a few who would be pleased to have Dr. Curtiss publish in full his lectures on Old Testament Theology. It is a matter for congratulation that the publication of the "Current Discussions" is to be continued.

CHEYNE'S JOB AND SOLOMON.*

When we recall the fact that Dr. Cheyne has published, within a very few years, commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and other Minor Prophets, we cannot but express surprise at the appearance of this new volume from his pen.

The writer seeks to apply to the Books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes, the same principles of criticism which have recently played so important a part in Pentateuch-study. Many suppose that the literary criticism is confined to the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and perhaps a few other books like Zechariah. These portions, it is true, have received most attention; but now the critic's work will cover all parts of Sacred Writ.

The work is introduced by a discussion "How is Old Testament Criticism Related to Christianity?" It is the author's belief that the day of "negative criticism is past," as well as "the day of a cheap ridicule of all critical analysis."

In fifteen chapters (pp. 115) on Job, six are given to the general interpretation of the various parts of the book, and in the remaining there are discussed (1) the traditional basis and purpose of Job, the growth of the book; (2) the date and place of composition; (3) argument from mythology; "one of the peculiarities of our poet is his willingness to appropriate mythic forms of expression from heathenism;" (4) argument from the doctrine of angels; (5) argument from parallel passages; (6) the disputed passages, especially the speeches of Elihu; (7) is Job a Hebraeo-Arabic poem? (8) the book from a religious point of view; (9) the book from a general and western point of view.

From this brief synopsis, it will be seen that the great questions of the book are considered. It need not be added that the discussion is at once scholarly and judicious. It is true, however, that Dr. Cheyne has taken such advanced ground that very few on this side of the ocean will be ready to follow him. There are no longer very many who feel compelled to acknowledge a veritable Job, or rather to understand the events and colloquies as having literally taken place. A large number will agree with the author in assigning the speeches of Elihu to a different writer. The assignment of the book to a late period will also be accepted by many. But the average Bible-student and conservative scholarship will be slow to grant any considerable degree of willingness on the part of the author of Job "to appropriate mythic forms of expression from heathendom." Dr. Cheyne's explanation of this willingness, granting that it exists, is certainly satisfactory: "It was not due to a feeble grasp of his own religion; it was rather due

* JOB AND SOLOMON; OR, The Wisdom of the Old Testament. By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation at Oxford. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1 Paternoster Square. 1887. 8vo, pp. 309. Price, \$1.25.

partly to the poet's craving for imaginative ornament, partly to his sympathy with his less developed readers, and a sense that some of these forms were admirably adapted to give reality to the conception of the 'living God.'"

Dr. Cheyne is certainly an adept in the work of comparing parallel passages; and he with great truth remarks that "a great point has been gained in one's critical and exegetical training when he has learned so to compare parallel passages as to distinguish true from apparent resemblances, and to estimate the degree of probability of imitation."

We cannot go into the details of his work on Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes; it will suffice to say that every-where there is evidence of the same calm and judicious weighing of opinions, and of the same advanced critical positions. The book is not one in which the ordinary Bible-student will be greatly interested; but the special student will find it rich in suggestion, and a model of critical research. We can only regret that it was not possible for the author to give us the philological notes which, according to his original design, were to have been included.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- La Sainte Bible.* Texte de la Vulgate, traduction française en regard avec commentaires. Introduction générale. T. 2. VIII. Géographie et archéologie bibliques; par M. l'abbé Trochon. Paris: lib. Lethillienx. 1887. 704 p. 14 plans et gravure 3, 8.
- The Patriarchal Times.* By T. Whitelaw. London: Nisbet. 1887. 8vo, pp. 306. 6s.
- Chrysostom: a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation.* By F. H. Chase. London: Bell & Son. 1887. 8vo, pp. 208. 6s.
- The Pharaohs of the Bondage and the Exodus.* Lectures by Charles S. Robinson, D. D., LL. D. New York: The Century Co. 12mo, pp. 199. \$0.50
- Die hebraeische Sprache als Sprache der Bibel.* By K. Furrer. Zurich: Schulthess. 1887. 8vo, pp. 26. M.0.80
- Der Prophet Jesaja, erläutert.* 2 Lfg. By C. J. Bredenkamp. Erlangen: Dieckert. 1887. 8vo, pp. 85-223. M.2.
- Untersuchungen ueber die Textgestalt und die Echtheit d. Buches Micha.* Ein krit. Commentar zu Micha. Leipzig: Hirzel. 1887. 8vo, pp. viii, 284. M.8.
- Beiträge zur jued. Alterthumskunde.* 1. Thl. Abhandlungen. Midrasch Tadsche, nach Handschriften edirt (in hebr. Sprache). By A. Epstein. Wien: Lippe. 1887. 8vo, pp. vi, 185. M.4.
- Seven, the Sacred Number; its use in Scripture and its application to Biblical Criticism.* By R. Samnell. London: Kegan Paul. 1887. 8vo, pp. 482. 10s.6d.
- La Sainte Bible, ou l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament.* Version d'Ostervald révisée. Nancy: impr. Berger, Levrant et Cie. 1887. 8vo, pp. vii, 1167.

ARTICLES.

- Significance in Oriental Names.* By William Wright, D. D., in S. S. Times, March 5, '87.
- Caravan Traffic in the Ancient World.* By Canon George Rawlinson, ib., March 19, '87.
- Old Testament Criticism for Readers of the English Bible.* By Prof. Howard Osgood, ib.
- The Coat of Many Colors.* By Prof. Isaac H. Hall, ib.
- The Name and Position of Potiphar.* By Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, ib.
- History of the Pentateuchal Composition Controversy.* By Prof. Dr. Ednard König, ib., March 26, '87.

- Old Testament Typography.* By Rev. J. F. Riggs in New York Observer, March 17, '87.
- The Synthetic Pentateuch.* IV. The Book of Numbers. By J. B. Thomas, D. D., in National Baptist, March 17, '87.
- Interpretation of Some Difficult Texts.* By Howard Osgood, D. D., in Homiletic Review, March, '87.
- Critical Theology, Kuenen on the Hexateuch.* Unitarian Review, March, '87.
- The New Testament in the Old.* By Prof. John De Witt in Herald and Presbyter, March 9, '87.
- Ezekiel and the Critics.* Jewish Messenger, March 11, '87.
- Der Baum des Lebens.* By G. Zietlow in Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben., I., '87.
- Jesaja XV. en XVI.* By Dr. H. Oort in Theol. Tijdschr., I., '87.
- Apokalyptische Studien.* [Die Apokalypse des Esra in syrischer Sprache.] By L. E. Iseli in Theol. Ztschr. ans d. Schweiz, I., '87.
- Das Neue Testament u. die moderne alttestamentliche, besonders pentateuchliche Kritik.* By R. Kübel in Beweis des Glaubens, Jan., '87.
- The Hittite Hieroglyphics Deciphered.* In Episcopal Record, March 17, '87.
- The Relation of the Old Testament to the New.* By Prof. R. V. Foster in Cumberland Presbyterian, March 17, '87.
- The Route of the Exodus.* By C. R. Gillett in Independent, March 24, '87.
- The Prophet Amos.* 1. Jehovah, God of Israel. By Rev. Prof. A. B. Davidson, D. D., in Expositor, March, '87.
- The Work of Bible Revision in Germany.* 2. Critical Part. By Prof. H. L. Strack, ib.
- Gold, Bedolach, and Shoham Stone.* A Study of Gen. II. 10-14. By Principal Sir J. W. Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., ib.
- Abraham et Isaac en Egypte et à Gherâr.* By R. Chatelant in Revue de theol. et de philos., I., '87.
- The Bahr-Jusuf and the Prophecy of Jacob.* By F. Cope Whitehouse in PSBA., VIII., '85-'86, pp. 6-25; pp. 57, 58.
- The Meters of David.* By C. J. Ball, ib.

REVIEWS.

- Prophet Jesaja* (by C. J. Bredenkamp). In Theol. Litblt., 1886, 48; by Zimmer in Beweis des Glaubens, Jan., '87.
- The Jewish and the Christian Messiah* (by V. H. Stanton). In Theol. Lit., by E. Schürer.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

MAY, 1887.

No. 9.

WHATEVER THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT may not have done, something certainly has been accomplished by it in *one* direction, viz., in emphasizing the importance of studying entire books of the Bible. The outline-studies of 1 and 2 Samuel, Isaiah XL.-LXVI., Genesis, Exodus and Hosea (in the present number) have been presented within a year; and the reception accorded them has been so favorable as to warrant the presentation, in the future, of similar studies of other books. The demand for these book-studies indicates most clearly a tendency to adopt more widely the historico-critical method of interpretation, for such work is of no value to those who adopt a mystical or allegorical method. The plan of the book-studies has been applied to the books of the New Testament by many of our readers. Let it also be applied to other Old Testament books. It should be borne in mind that such a study prepared by one's self will prove to be vastly more helpful than if prepared by another. Let every man make his own outlines, and let no minister, no interpreter of the Divine Word rest satisfied until every book of both Testaments has thus been treated.

THE interpretation given individual verses of the Bible, by intelligent ministers, is sometimes painful. One often thinks that the minister has neglected to note whether the verse under consideration belongs to the Old or to the New Testament. Too frequently he fails even to determine whether it was uttered by an inspired or an uninspired writer, it having been forgotten that inspired writers often give us the words of others without necessarily endorsing them. It is, of course, an every-day occurrence to assign to a verse a sense which it not only does not have, but which it could not receive by the most tortured exegesis. Why will men persist in this thing? In a recent

"Easter service" on the "Resurrection of Christ," out of twelve Old Testament passages cited as bearing on this subject, only *two* contain any reference to a resurrection, and but *one* of these to the resurrection of the Messiah. Yet verses from all parts of Scripture, which a close examination of the context would have shown to be entirely foreign to the subject, are brought together and interpreted as teaching this fact. Such work brings discredit upon the Bible and its doctrines. There is nothing more true than that the friends of the Bible have done it much more injury than its enemies have ever been able to accomplish.

THE prevalence of the "critical" ideas in their destructive form is, without doubt, greatly to be deplored. There are other tendencies of Bible-teaching to-day, which are equally injurious. Very few realize the strong grasp which the "mystical" tendency holds on the Bible-students of our day. Some openly confess it and pride themselves in it. Many are unconsciously under its sway. There are very few who are not more or less tainted with it. Is it then so great an evil? Undoubtedly. To this tendency may be traced, nearly, if not all, of the reproach which has been heaped upon the Sacred Word from the beginning of its existence. At its feet may be laid the responsibility for the low estimate at which the "world" regards the Bible. Let it once be understood that Sacred Writ has one meaning,—a meaning which can be ascertained by the application of the laws of language and the principles of common sense, and the ridicule of it which one meets in every class of society, the indifference to it which characterizes so large a portion of so-called believers, will cease. The darkness of the middle ages has passed. Let this instrument, prepared and guided by Satan himself, but wielded by the Bible's own friends, be broken in pieces, and rendered useless.

NO Bible-student, in these days, can be blind to the interest, so widely prevailing, in the work of exploration. If one will but sum up the wonderful discoveries that have been made within twenty years, or even within a decade, he will be surprised at the results. In Egypt, in Syria, in Babylonia, every month brings to us new developments. The work of exploration is largely due to the increased interest in Bible-study; but on the other hand, it contributes largely to this same end. Two difficulties, however, prevent our reaping the full results of the activity now being manifested in this direction:

(1) The slowness of Bible-students, in general, to take hold and make use of these results. The average student is indifferent to the whole subject and allows himself to remain in entire ignorance of the most important facts. He prefers the old-fashioned, mystical, hit-or-miss way of studying the Bible; that which requires study or investigation he leaves to others. "Scott" and "Henry" are all that he needs. Such a method scarcely does justice to that book which, of all books, should engross our attention.

(2) The lack of means to carry on the work as rapidly and as widely as it deserves. An investment of money which would be more profitable would be difficult to find. Do we desire evidence to substantiate the claims of the Bible? Such work will accomplish more in five years than theoretical argument will accomplish in a century. By a union of effort on the part of men of means and men able to carry on such explorations, the most valuable results could be obtained. Scholars stand ready to prosecute the work even at the risk of their lives. Are there not men who will furnish the necessary money?

THREE years ago the editor of THE STUDENT was sharply criticised and soundly berated for certain statements concerning the prevalence of the so-called critical views. The statements made at that time were strictly correct, though denied by many. In this, as in all other mooted questions, time points out the truth. In the last number, the statement of Dr. Samuel Ives Curtiss was quoted to the effect that but a *single* Old Testament professor in Germany still maintains the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The April *Presbyterian Review* contains the following statement by Dr. Charles A. Briggs:—

"There has been a steady advance until the present position of agreement has been reached in which Jew and Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Rationalistic and Evangelical scholars, Reformed and Lutheran, Presbyterian and Episcopal, Unitarian, Methodist and Baptist all concur. The analysis of the Hexateuch into several distinct original documents is a purely literary question in which no article of faith is involved. Whoever in these times, in the discussion of the literary phenomena of the Hexateuch, appeals to the ignorance and prejudices of the multitude as if there were any peril to the faith in these processes of the Higher Criticism risks his reputation for scholarship by so doing. There are no Hebrew professors on the Continent of Europe, so far as I know, who would deny the literary analysis of the Hexateuch into the four great documents. The professors of Hebrew in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and tutors in a large number of theological colleges hold to the same opinion. A very considerable number of the Hebrew professors of America are in accord with them. There are, indeed, a few professional Hebrew scholars

who hold to the traditional opinion, but these are in a hopeless minority. I doubt whether there is any question of scholarship whatever in which there is greater agreement among scholars than in this question of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch.''

Now, however true or false this critical position itself may be, its acceptance as a matter of fact is very general, and is rapidly becoming more general. It is not wise to shut our eyes to *facts*, however unpleasant they may be. Grant that the prevalence of these ideas is destructive to the interests of true Bible-work; the thing to be done, in this case, is to plan how their influence shall be counteracted, and not how those who are not in a position to ascertain the truth for themselves shall be convinced that they do not exist.

THE PERFECTION OF THE DECALOGUE.

By TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York City.

We read in the nineteenth Psalm. "The law of Jehovah is perfect." and this is exactly and literally true. It is therefore an exception to what generally obtains in this world. All men acquiesce in the couplet of Pope,

"Whoever thinks a faultless piece to see,
Thinks what ne'er was, nor is, nor e'er shall be,"

which simply reiterates what was said two thousand years before in Holy Writ, "I have seen an end of all perfection." But as the same writer proceeds immediately to say, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad." Incompleteness belongs to all the works of man, but the work of God is like himself perfect, and that not in the sense conveyed in the well-known verse of the poet-laureate:

"Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null,"

but in the higher sense of being in substance, form, expression and tone, exactly adapted to its purpose. This has been denied, not only by avowed enemies of our holy religion, but even by some who minister acceptably at its altar. The subject, therefore, is worthy of consideration. The purpose of the ten commandments was to reveal a rule of duty for men, and this we insist was accomplished in a way that leaves nothing to desire. The truth may be shown,

I. By the *Nature of the Law itself.*

Its contents are just what they ought to be. They enjoin only what is right; they forbid only what is wrong. They err neither in excess nor in defect. No error or incongruity can be detected from beginning to end. The ground that is covered takes in all the relations and interests of man, the recognition, the worship, the reverence, and the proportion of time he owes to God, all relative duties arising from the family, the household and the state, the regard due to the life, the domestic circle, the property and the good name of one's neighbor; and then the whole winds up with a precept that shows that thought as well as speech and act is included in the obligation. No modern theory of practical ethics discloses any duty which is not contained in the Sinaitic summary. That summary is suited to all lands, all races, all times, all states of society. It contains nothing that is sectional, or national, or fortuitous, or temporary. The fifth commandment may seem an exception, because the promise attached to it mentions "the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," whence some have rashly inferred that the whole decalogue was simply a Jewish statute and destitute of universal significance and applicability. But the impropriety of this inference is shown by the language of the Apostle Paul in the opening of the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians. Writing to a Gentile church nearly all whose members were of heathen origin (cf. II. 11-13; IV. 17-19), he enforces the duty of children to their parents by citing this precept, altering the last clause so that it reads, "and thou mayest live long upon the earth," thus clearly teaching that the reference to the Holy Land in the original statute was a provisional feature which in no degree

limited or impaired the world-wide and perpetual scope of the obligation. It is clear, therefore, that the code is addressed to man as man every-where and always. It lays hold of Jew and Greek, Barbarian and Scythian, male and female, bond and free, high and low, all nations, all classes without exception; for whatever other differences obtain, all stand upon the same footing as rational, responsible beings, and alike need some authoritative directory of conduct.

But, while the code is thus comprehensive and far-reaching, it is also succinct and brief, as a manual always should be. It resolves human duty into its constituent elements, and then sums up these elements into a decade of precepts whose force is not to be mistaken. Obedience to parents, the very earliest of earthly obligations, stands for the whole series of relative duties. And rightly, for the good child will naturally be the good husband, and master, and citizen. Nor is it conceivable that one relation should be defined and cared for, while others, equally natural and permanent and general, should be neglected. In like manner when the code takes up the rights of man in society, the leading overt act of gross transgression is selected and specified, because the prohibition of it means the prohibition of all lesser forms of the same sin. And the last precept lays particular stress upon the heart, out of which are the issues of life. Thus there is provided a *vade mecum* of the most satisfactory kind. A little summary having no more parts than can be counted on the fingers of both hands contains the whole substance of the moral law. It realizes the proverbial saying, "The *Iliad* in a nutshell." A child can easily learn it by heart. A man can recall its precepts anywhere. It is a portable manual always available. As a summation of ethics it has never been surpassed save once, and then it was by its divine author—when our Lord, in answer to the question of a lawyer (Matt. xxii. 37-40), compressed the ten commandments into two. Apart from this most felicitous condensation, the decalogue remains the briefest, clearest and most complete statement of human duty the world has ever seen.

But the order in which its precepts are arranged is as remarkable as their nature. The two tables treat first of what belongs to God, then of what is due to man, with the clear implication not only that the former is superior to the latter, but also that it is the basis upon which it rests. Ethics, so far from being a substitute for religion, is its offspring and dependant. The first table begins with the ultimate fact of the divine existence, then prescribes the way in which God is to be worshiped, next the reverence with which every manifestation of his nature is to be regarded, after which comes the period of time to be consecrated to his service, and the duty which is due to those who are God's representatives on earth, whether parents or other superiors. The second table begins with life, because the dead have no more to do with earth, and then, after this most necessary provision, guards personal purity and the integrity of the domestic circle, after which comes the right of property, a right so nearly connected in all lands and ages with the preservation of social order. This is followed by a guaranty for the maintenance of truth and charity of speech, and the whole concludes with a precept that shows that in all cases it is not so much external obedience as the state of the heart that is required. Now this arrangement of the divine commands is the best conceivable. It could hardly be altered in the least without injury. It puts first what is first in reality. The claims of God transcend those of all his creatures, and attention to these is a condition precedent to the discharge of all other duties. If experience teaches anything, it is that a divine

sanction is indispensable to a proper and permanent restraint upon human conduct. To love God is the first and great commandment. In like manner the second table proceeds, taking up in turn the chief social obligations of mankind, and riveting them all by a final precept which lays its firm grasp upon the inner man of the heart.

Once more, the perfection of the decalogue may be argued from its manifest reasonableness. If there be no God, then religion does not exist, and it is folly to talk of sacred precepts; but if there be a God, the maker of heaven and earth, and sole ruler of the children of men, the one in whom we live and move and have our being, then the duties prescribed in the first table are due unto him. Nothing less can meet his exalted claims. Every feeling of propriety and gratitude summons us to render to him love, honor, reverence, worship and obedience. And so with the other part of the Ten Words. If men be a race, if they have sprung from a common ancestor, if they are of one blood, if they are linked together, not casually or temporarily, but by a bond of nature, then beyond question they owe to each other all that the second table enjoins. They are members one of another, and as such must be governed invariably by the law of love. There is nothing arbitrary or capricious in any precept. All spring from a common source, and are self-commended by their bearing upon human welfare. And as far as the decalogue is obeyed in its spirit, just so far is earth made to resemble heaven.

But the decalogue is no exception to the rule that in this world nothing human or divine escapes criticism, and accordingly fault has been found with it, and sometimes even by those who are within the Christian pale. People have tried to identify it with the moral character of the people to whom it was first given, just as if it were a natural development of the human faculties instead of being a descent from above just as really as the "great sheet let down from heaven by four corners," which Peter saw at Joppa. Its constant claim is that it came to man, not from him. It expresses, therefore, not the moral ideas which he has attained, but those which are held by his Maker and by him put into the form of a statute.

(1) Of the older class of objections the most common is that no provision has anywhere been made for friendship or the love of country. But the former is not properly a subject of legislation, nor could its terms or degrees be intelligently prescribed. In itself it is a felicity rather than a duty, and it is more properly to be placed among the rewards of moral excellence than among its obligations. Indeed, the moment it is made a duty, the fine aroma of the relation exhales, and its chief charm disappears. Its whole value lies in its spontaneous character. As for the duty of patriotism that may be safely left to the action of natural causes. Experience shows that the great danger here is, not that men will fail in love of their country, but that they will become so absorbed in it as to forget the rights of individuals and the immutable claims of humanity and justice. And when patriotism is pampered to excess it ceases to be a virtue, and is rather "the bond and cement of a guilty confederation." Nor if the relative duties (of rulers and ruled), fairly implied in the fifth commandment, are faithfully discharged by each party, is there any reason to fear that men will fall short of the attachment to their country which is universally recognized as appropriate and becoming. The law, therefore, without enjoining the duty, lays the basis for its rational and consistent exercise.

(2) The Rev. R. W. Dale, in his excellent little work on the Ten Commandments, says that they "were not intended to constitute a complete code of morals. There are many sins which they do not condemn, and there are many virtues which they do not enforce. The symmetrical completeness of human systems of ethics is not to be found either in the Old Testament or the New; and certainly we have no right to expect that these laws, given to a race which must have suffered the gravest moral injury from protracted slavery to a heathen nation, should cover the whole ground of moral duty." If this be so, it is very singular that, while almost everything else in Judaism has become obsolete, this code has kept, and still keeps, its place in the theology, the catechisms, and the ritual, of the Christian world. The whole church cannot have been mistaken for eighteen centuries. The omissions which some detect are seeming rather than real. It is true that the second table contains only a series of naked prohibitions, but the principle underlying these negations sweeps the whole field of human duty. The inward and spiritual character of the morality here enjoined is made abundantly plain by the closing precept, which casts its piercing light upon all that precedes. It does not annex any additional province of obligation, but affirms that the law covers every movement of the mind, as well as the actions of the body, and brings the whole man, inner and outer, under the sway of duty. It was this tenth commandment that wrought a spiritual revolution in the soul of the great apostle (Rom. vii. 7), and led him to the true experimental knowledge of his natural condition and character. Nor was this due to any strained application of the words, but rather to the strict and natural interpretation of their meaning. Moreover, when the rich young ruler came to our Lord with the weighty question, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" the plain categorical answer was, "If thou wouldest enter into life keep the commandments." Now it is impossible to explain or justify this answer save on the principle that the commandments comprehended all human duty. It is true that the subsequent words of the Saviour show that he intended to convince the amiable ruler of his self-ignorance, and bring him to a proper sense of sin; but this fact in no way lessens the intrinsic force of his declaration as to the weight and significance of the decalogue.

(3) The Rev. Dr. Dykes, in his "The Law of the Ten Words," speaks of this code as being of a "juvenile or primary character," and says that its "requirements are concrete, and expressed in a negative or prohibitory form," and insists upon the fact "that the sanction of the decalogue was fear," as if there could be a law without such a sanction. Yet he claims for it "an admirable breadth and massiveness," and says that "it succeeds in sweeping the whole field of duty," which is just what this paper insists upon. His book closes with a chapter upon the "uses and defects of the law," which is very unhappily named, for it is not shown that there are any defects in the law; nay, the exact contrary is stated, viz., that it is a pure transcript of the divine holiness. It did not restore spiritual life to fallen men, but the reason of this lay not in any shortcomings in the Ten Words, but in the hopelessly injured condition of man himself. It follows, then, that however inefficacious the law is as a means of saving men, it is absolutely without spot as a rule of duty. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, since it is simply an expression of the nature of God in the form of moral requirement, and a necessary expression of that nature in view of the existence of moral

beings? Law, according to Julius Müller, is simply rectitude embodied in the form of command.

(4) Again, it has sometimes been objected to the completeness of the decalogue that there are many things binding upon us which, without a further revelation of the will of God, we should never have known to be obligatory. The great duty of men under the Gospel is faith, as our Lord said, "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." And the whole Scripture is filled with exhortations of every kind to repent; yet there is not a word of this in the ten commandments. The answer is that no law makes provision for its own violation save in the way of penalty. When it declares clearly and sufficiently what is duty, and annexes an appropriate sanction, its function is ended. If a remedial system be introduced, that is an act of sovereignty which carries with it its own conditions, but in no respect interferes with or derogates from the original statute. The law which the sinner has broken holds its primeval character, and it is still true that perfect compliance with its enactments is perfect compliance with the will of God and needs no supplement of any kind or from any source.

(5) It has been said that while the Ten Words deal well and fully with our duty to our neighbor, they omit the consideration of our duty towards ourselves; and the Bishop of Carlisle, in a sermon before the university of Oxford, said that the criticism might be a true one. Is it so? Nay, on the contrary, is it not clear that men are so closely interlinked together in the whole circle of their relations and interests, that he who performs his duty to his Maker and to his fellows must needs perform whatever obligations he owes to himself? The latter may be comprehended in self-support, self-defense, self-control and self-culture. Yet every one of these, besides being involved in the nature of man as a moral and responsible being, is necessarily secured by the discharge of his duty as laid down in the decalogue. If he does not support himself, then he takes that support wrongfully from others? If he does not control himself, how can he avoid sin against others? If he does not train his own body, mind and heart, how can he perform properly his part in society? The objection is purely fanciful. Duties to one's self are most surely fulfilled when they are considered as parts of what a man owes to other beings, and there is no need of their being put in a distinct category.

II. By *Comparison with Ethnic Statutes.*

But excellent as the decalogue is in its own nature, our conceptions of its merits are greatly exalted by comparing it with the moral law of other religious systems. Nowhere is there to be found a compact, orderly and comprehensive statement of practical ethics such as is contained in the Ten Words. The most important relic of the literature of ancient Egypt is the Book of the Dead, which treats of the beatification of the departed, and represents it in the form of certain recitations made by the deceased person himself in the nether world. The 125th chapter of this book is said by LePage Renouf to be the oldest known code of private and public morality. In it the person who enters into the hall of the Two-fold Maât recites the sins of which he claims not to have been guilty. The list of these sins runs up to forty-two, and it includes crimes of theft, fraud, falsehood, oppression, violence, evil-speaking, and the like, so as in some measure to justify M. Lenormant in ascribing to the Egyptians "a refined morality." But these

sins are not catalogued according to any scientific arrangement. There is a great deal of repetition, and no classification. Sins of omission as well as of commission are mentioned, and those of the mind as well as those of the body; yet there is no discrimination of these from the violation of mere police regulations for public order. Similar statements are found in inscriptions upon the tombs so abundant in the Nile valley, and in various papyri which Ægyptologists have brought to light. But nowhere do we find a manual for popular use giving in condensed form the substance of religious and moral duties. Nothing in the shape of such a code has been discovered. The wisdom of the Egyptians was proverbial in Scripture (1 Kgs. iv. 30) and elsewhere, but it did not suffice to give them either a sensible mode of worship or a coherent and authoritative rule of daily life. No inscription and no papyrus has yet disclosed any parallel to the utterance from Sinai.

The same difficulty confronts us when we pass over to India, and consult the ancient records of Brahmanism. Here we have a renowned law-book, known as *The Institutes of Menu*. Its contents are very varied, extending from a system of cosmogony at the beginning, to the doctrine of transmigration of souls and final beatitude at the end. Several of its twelve books treat of duties, and one sets forth private morals. And scattered through the pages are found many admirable sentiments; but there are just as many, if not far more, of an opposite character. What, however, concerns us is that there is no comprehensive summary of faith and duty, nothing that formulates principles, or suggests a moral system. Physics, metaphysics, education, government, diet, caste, social life, asceticism, penance and abstinence, are all treated upon the same plane and as of equal importance. The killing of a cow is a sin to be atoned for by severe penances. He who strikes a Brahman must remain in hell a thousand years. Benevolent falsehood (e. g., to save an innocent man from a tyrant) is a venial sin. No religious rite is allowed to a woman apart from her husband. A thousand such statements as these occur in the book, nor is there any discrimination as to their relative dignity and usefulness. A cento of just and important rules might be collected from its pages, but they never were collected, nor were the Hindus ever favored with any brief compend which might be brought into comparison with the Ten Words of Moses.

Quite the contrary is the case with the other Indian religion or philosophy which for a time shared with Brahmanism the confidence of the people, Buddhism. There was a period when it was dominant in the peninsula, but in the seventh century it began to decline, and in the seventeenth it was extinct, although in the coterminous regions it still prevails and counts three or four hundred millions of adherents. As it is a religion without God, if the paradox be allowable, it lays great stress upon all kinds of moral duties. The great object of human desire and effort is Nirvāna, the precise nature of which need not be discussed here. The theoretical way to Nirvāna consists of eight steps, which I need not stay to particularize. The chief ethics of the system lies in certain commands or "precepts of aversion," which are exactly ten in number. Five of these are of universal obligation, and five apply only to the monks, i. e., the clergy of the system, for all its priests are monks, taking the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. What now are these precepts? First, do not kill; second, do not steal; third, do not commit adultery; fourth, do not lie; fifth, do not become intoxicated. The second pentad is, first, abstain from food out of season, i. e., after midday; second, abstain from dances, singing and theatrical representa-

tions; third, abstain from ornaments and perfumes; fourth, abstain from a lofty and luxurious couch; fifth, abstain from taking any gold or silver. Here, now, is fair room for comparison. Of the first pentad, four are rules which exactly answer to the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth commands of the decalogue, but the fifth prohibits simply one form of sensual indulgence, which, however gross and irrational and even bestial as it is, does not head any distinct category of morals, and is itself fairly included in the scope of the first precept which, forbidding the taking of life, forbids whatever carnal habits tend in that direction. But what shall be said of the second series, which concerns those who have embraced the religious life and laboriously seek the chief good? How puerile they are! How unspiritual and formal! Whatever claim may be made for a "comparatively pure and elevated morality" in the teachings of Buddha, it must be admitted that the ten precepts of aversion cut but a sorry figure beside the ten commandments of Scripture. The resemblance in four precepts only renders the difference in the other six the more striking. Buddhism has its good points, some of which are very admirable, but as a system it falls far short of truth and propriety. It furnishes no convenient manual which is suited to all places, all times and all classes, and which if obeyed from the heart leaves nothing to desire.

If we turn to ancient Greece, there is no name among lawgivers that stands so high as that of Solon. So confused and variant are the accounts that we have of him that it is hard to say how much is mythical and how much is historical; and modern writers have come to the conclusion that it was the habit of the Attic writers to attribute to him every piece of wise legislation the precise authorship of which they were unable to discover. But for our purpose the exact truth upon this point is of no moment. The Solonian legislation took in a wide range. It limited estates, classified citizens according to their income, encouraged agriculture, regulated marriage, provided for the transmission of property by will, put honor upon industry, checked luxury, forbade evil-speaking; indeed, extended to almost every subject of social importance. But we look in vain for any short, compendious summation of duty. Some remarkable utterances of his have come down the stream of tradition, but nothing that can be compared with the decalogue, or that can for a moment be considered as taking its place. The best wisdom of enlightened Greece in this respect fell far behind what had been received and adopted ages before in Judea.

The case is somewhat different when we pass to the literature of the other classic race, the Latins. Here we find in existence, at an early period (462 B. C.), a series of statutes engraved on bronze tablets, which were twelve in number, and hence gave name to the code as the Twelve Tables (*Lex Duodecim Tabularum*). These were praised by Livy as the fountain of public and private law, and Cicero (*de Orat.*, I., 44) pronounced them incredibly superior to the jurisprudence of any other people. They are no longer extant in their entirety, so that their contents as a whole and even their order and arrangement are unknown. Our knowledge is gained from those portions which were quoted by jurists and others. From these fragments it appears that the first three tables treated of judicial proceedings, the fourth of the paternal power, the fifth of wills and succession, the sixth of property and possession, the seventh of buildings and fields, the eighth of injuries to person or property, from which a right of compensation arose, the ninth of public and political law, the tenth of sacred rites and observances, while the eleventh and twelfth were supplementary to the others. This, it must be acknowl-

edged, was a code of extraordinary completeness and excellence, and it must have had vast influence in forming that peculiar character which enabled the Romans, after conquering the world by arms, every-where to organize it by law. Yet it was only civil and political. It regulated the outward and not the inward. It announced no principles, and rested upon no supernatural authority, but so far as appears, simply put into statute form what had been already the consuetudinary law of the Latin race.

It may then be fairly claimed that the decalogue stands alone in the literature of the world. Whether we go to the west or to the farthest east, nowhere is there found anything approaching it in correctness and completeness as a standard of human duty. All rivals fall short either in excess or in defect. They are vague, or inaccurate, or confused. They mingle the trivial with the important, or they confuse ethics with politics or economics. They overlook the state of the heart, and they omit to ground their precepts either in right reason or the will of the supreme lawgiver. In distinction from all these, the Ten Words stand out as a clean-cut manual, resolving all duty into its essential principles, stating these with the utmost precision and clearness, and basing them upon the nature and perfections of the ever-living God. As has well been said, "There is contained in this short summary the outline of all treatises on morality and all codes of justice. Not the least blemish of any vicious or barbarous legislation is mingled with it. The form is Hebrew, national; but the truth is as broad as human life, and fitted to the wants of the race. If we compare this code with the remains of other ancient peoples, with the code of Menu, the sacred books of China, the fragments of the Persian religion, there is nothing like it."

THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION,—RECENT PHASES.

BY PROF. HENRY P. SMITH, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

While the school of Wellhausen in general seems determined to adhere to its theory of the late date (post-exilic) of the Priest Code, and consequently of the redaction of the Pentateuch, there are not wanting signs of a reaction.

The first of these is a notice by Baethgen of Finsler's attack on Wellhausen.¹ Although the reviewer finds that "the fortress cannot be carried without heavier artillery than is at Finsler's disposal," he yet pronounces the attack a severe one, and himself supports it by contributions of his own. He asserts, for example, that there are passages in the earlier literature (before the exile) which show acquaintance with A (the first Elohist). He believes, further, that the comparison of Israel with other nations does not show the order of development assumed by Wellhausen. "According to Wellhausen, the notion of sin and guilt was as good as absent from the earlier religion of Israel. . . . But in the Babylonian penitential psalms of the highest antiquity (which are not annihilated by the fact that sport is made of them) the consciousness of guilt is expressed in the most affecting manner, in part in forms which remind us of the biblical Psalms. The

¹ Finsler, *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausen's von Geschichte und Religion des Alten Testaments* (Zürich, 1887). Notice by F. Baethgen in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, No. 4.

heathen have mourned over their sins; and it is extremely difficult to believe that this consciousness is something secondary to the Israelites, whose importance to the world consists so largely in their recognition of the nature of sin and the necessity of expiation."

Again; the idea of the covenant between God and his people can hardly be of late date. This idea is found in very ancient times among non-Israelites. "The Baal-Berith of the Shechemites is not the Baal who protects treaties, as so often ungrammatically explained, but the Baal with whom one has made a covenant."

Once more; according to Wellhausen the ritual regulations were codified only after the destruction of the temple, because there would have been no occasion earlier. But the lists of offerings of Marseilles and Carthage (which show some striking similarities to Leviticus) are examples in just the other direction. The fact that in Carthage, centuries before its fall, regulations concerning offerings—regulations scrupulous in detail and allied to the Hebrew—existed in *written form* seems a very important one.

One of the fathers of the Graf school was Vatke, "a prophet of the past," as Wellhausen himself calls him. Since Vatke's death his lectures on Old Testament Introduction¹ have been published by one of his pupils. Great must be the astonishment of his supposed followers to find that he has abandoned the ground they have reached. Vatke, at the latest stage of his investigations, believed that the Elohim document (A or Q, or first Elohist), instead of being post-exilic, is as early as the time of Hezekiah (say the end of the eighth century) and earlier than the others, except the so-called second Elohist, which preceded it by a few years. These two, with the Yahvist, were already combined into one book before Deuteronomy was written, and *this* composite book (not Deuteronomy) was the "Book of the Law" found in the time of Josiah. Deuteronomy was not written until just before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. These results are reached after a minute examination of all the documents.

Even more importance will be attached to Dillmann's re-statement of his views at the end of his now completed commentary on the Hexateuch.² The author gives the arguments against the Mosaic authorship, and a sketch of the history of criticism. He then takes up each document, analyzes it, and attempts to fix its age, beginning with Deuteronomy. This book he supposes (with the majority of critics) to have been written not long before the time of Josiah. The second Elohist (B) he places in the first half of the ninth century. "That first in the eighth century it was discovered that the name Jahve was introduced by Moses, or that the worship of the Nehushtan was unlawful, or that child-sacrifice was not allowable, or that other gods must be put away in order to the service of Jahve, or that the prophet is a man who *must* proclaim the will of God—Kuenen will hardly be able to show." The author of B was a citizen of the Northern Kingdom. The Yahvist, on the other hand, belongs to the Kingdom of Judah. He can hardly have written earlier than the middle of the eighth century.

Coming now to A, it must first be noticed that it is itself a composite writing. This has indeed been acknowledged so far as to separate the "Holiness-laws."

¹ Wilhelm Vatke's *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Bonn, 1886.

² *Kurzfassendes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Dreizehnte Lieferung. Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, von Dr. August Dillmann. Leipzig, 1886. The essay on the "Composition of the Hexateuch" occupies pp. 592-690.

Dillmann prefers to carry the analysis further, and to group the sections under the two signs A and S. S (Sinai-laws) comprises, besides Lev. xvii.—xxvi. (Holiness-laws); Lev. v. 1-6, 21-24; parts of Lev. xi.; Exod. xxxi. 13 seq.; possibly Lev. xiii. seq.; Num. v. 11-13; xv. 18-21. Besides these, however, we find a number of legal pieces difficult to place. But many enactments contained in S are already acknowledged by the Deuteronomist as Mosaic. The variations between S and D do not argue for the priority of the latter, nor does their relation to Ezekiel. The form of some of the laws, however, points to the exile as the time in which they were written down, or at least recast.

For the main document (A) we cannot assign an earlier date than that of B, and the author seems to have known C also, or some similar compilation. On the other hand, we can hardly place it later than Deuteronomy. The most plausible date is not far from the year 800. A, B and C were combined early in the exile, and D was inserted not long after. If there was any later editorial work, it consisted in inserting a few scattered pieces—some parts of S perhaps.

That so eminently fair a critic as Dillmann, after carefully working through the whole Pentateuch in the light of the most recent discussion, should hold his ground so ably is a fact of the first importance.

A BOOK-STUDY: HOSEA.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO, M. A.

Bangor Theological Seminary.

I. LITERATURE.

Perhaps the most serviceable equipment one can have is Cheyne's *Hosea*, belonging to the Cambridge Bible Series for Schools, and Keil on the *Minor Prophets*. They are mutually corrective. Keil is of more value than Cheyne to the student who studies the Hebrew. He is not sufficiently quick to feel the life in the midst of which Hosea lived. On the other hand, Cheyne sometimes needlessly rejects the reading of the Hebrew text, and does not give contextual interpretation its true influence; for he is too apt to ignore the course of thought. When one guards himself against these defects, he will find his best help in Keil and Cheyne. Lange's and the Bible commentaries are useful. So also Ellicott's commentary for English readers. Pusey's is quite disappointing. It will be of use to read Prof. W. R. Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, Lecture IV.; Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, vol. IV., pp. 176-270; Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, article "Hosea;" and the Old Testament Introductions, as Keil's, Bleek's, and Davidson's. It is not advisable to occupy the full range of the books mentioned. The Book of Hosea should be the object of study. Let it all be done in writing or memorizing.

II.

1. Master the contents of the book according to directions in previous book-studies, writing on separate slips of paper the topic or topics of each chapter, studying these topics until, without hesitation, the details of each can be recalled, learning so as to recall with the number of each chapter the topics and the contents of that chapter.

2. Index the contents of the book under the following heads :
 - (1) The immorality of the Northern Kingdom.
 - (2) Sinfulness of the idolatrous Yahweh-worship.
 - (3) Sinfulness of the foreign policy.
 - (4) Sinfulness of the separation of the kingdoms.
 - (5) The blessings which Yahweh had bestowed.
 - (6) The punishments which Yahweh must inflict.
 - (7) The reform of Israel and its future blessing.
3. Analyze the book :
 - (a) Into what two general divisions is it naturally divided ?
 - (b) Take the first division, divide it into three subdivisions. Analyze these subdivisions into sections, where the thought requires it.
 - (c) Take the second division, divide it into subdivisions according to head (7) of the analysis. Divide these subdivisions into sections and subsections, according to the subject-matter. To illustrate in chapter first,
 - 1.—1. Introduction.
 2. Marriage.
 3. Children, and symbolic meaning.
 10. Promise of blessing.

III. STUDY OF THE TEXT.

1. The first division.
 - (a) Is ch. III. a reiteration or continuation of chh. I., II.? i. e., does it repeat the lesson taught in the former chapters? or, does it give the sequel of them? Or, in other words, do chh. I. and III. have a common starting-point and goal? or, is ch. I. 9 the starting-point of ch. II.?
 - (b) Is the discourse of chh. I. and III. to be regarded as history, parable, or vision? What reasons are there for and against calling it history? At this point gather all the symbolic acts recorded in the Bible, and see what light they throw on the subject. What reasons are there for and against regarding it as a parable? Define the allegory, symbolic parable, and typical parable; and gather all instances of each in the Bible, and see what light they throw on the subject. What reasons are there for and against holding that these chapters give the contents of one or more experiences like that of Peter's in Acts x. 9, 16? Gather all instances in the Bible of the narratives of visions which are to the point, and see what evidence they afford. State briefly your conclusion and the grounds for it.
 - (c) What is the reason for the difference between Hos. I. 4 and 2 Kgs. x. 30? Hos. I. 11, what is meant by "the day of Jezreel"? III. 5, what is meant by "the latter days"? Study this phrase here and where else you find in the Old Testament "the last (or, latter) days." Cf. Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, article *αἰών*.
 - (d) Study the symbolic language all through the book. Gather the persons that are symbols, and explain them. Gather the things (e. g., the *bow*, I. 5), and explain them.
 - (e) Read through the second part, and note all the passages which are obscure, or excite wonder respecting their meaning. Then, taking them up one by one, gather all the available evidence respecting their meaning under the following heads:

- (1) the natural meaning of the words;
 - (2) the evidence which the context gives;
 - (3) the evidence given by the books as a whole;
 - (4) the evidence from the Bible in general;
 - (5) the evidence given by history, geography and any other branch of knowledge.
- (f) Revise the analysis of the book formed as above, 1. 3, in accord with the results of this exegetical study, and commit it to memory.

IV. QUESTIONS OF INTRODUCTION.

1. Historical questions.
 - (a) When did Hosea prophesy?
 - (b) What was the internal condition of the Northern Kingdom in his time?
 - (c) Sketch the history of the Northern Kingdom until the time of Hosea.
 - (d) What were the relations between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms?
 - (e) What were the relations between the Northern Kingdom and Egypt, Syria, and Assyria, in the time of Hosea?
2. Who was Hosea? What can be learned as to his character? Of what kingdom was he a native? Gather the evidence on these subjects under two heads: the evidence in the book itself; the evidence from all other sources, including tradition.
3. What evidence does the book afford on the following subjects?—Who uttered the contents of the book? Who wrote it? What evidence may be gathered from other sources?
4. For whom was this book written? For whom uttered? Gather the evidence under the heads internal and external.
5. When was the book uttered? When written? Determine the relation to be found between the contents of the book and the times in which it was uttered.
6. Where was it uttered? Where written?
7. On account of what causes was it uttered? For what purpose was it uttered? For what purpose was it written?
8. What are the characteristics of the style?

V. QUESTIONS OF CRITICISM.

1. What is the position of Hosea as respects the Mosaic covenant, law and priesthood?
2. Is the book two units? This question will deal chiefly with the second division of the book. In dealing with the subject it will be well to consider it under the following heads: Is this second division a patchwork or compilation from various authors? Is it a single piece of composition, like a sermon, written and uttered on one occasion? Is it a unit as being designed and uttered from one mind? Is it a collection of utterances made on several different occasions? Is it a general resumé by one person of his general preaching through a series of years?
3. Is the influence of any other writers manifested in this book either by quotation or by the general trend of thought?
4. Does the book show traces of re-editing?

VI. OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

1. Gather and systematize the passages indicating Hosea's idea of God.
2. Also those passages which indicate the proper and the actual relations between God and man.
3. What ideal of the Kingdom of God is expressed? Positively, by describing what the kingdom ought to be; negatively, by describing the failure of the Northern Kingdom; prophetically, by describing what the Kingdom of God will be.
4. What is taught respecting the future of God's people? In the immediate future? In the remote future? Also, what is the relation between the immediate future and the remote future?
5. What is the relation of the contents of the book to (a) the development of the theocracy? (b) to the sacred canon?

AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN BIBLE-LANDS.

BY PROF. E. C. MITCHELL, D. D.,

Cambridge, Mass.

These are inspiring days for the biblical interpreter. The science of New Testament criticism, at last placed upon a solid basis of accurate scholarship and illuminated by valuable manuscript discoveries; the principles of interpretation emancipated both from slavish literalism and dogmatic spiritualism, and clarified by common sense; the hitherto sealed book of the Holy Land, now opened and copied and photographed and brought to our doors; the "treasures in Egypt" now being brought forth from their "store-houses," and even the Pharaohs rising from their tombs to give us testimony; and, to crown all, the key placed in our hands for the decipherment of the secrets of antiquity, preserved for us on "tables of stone" in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia; these are the conditions under which the Christian scholar of to-day enters upon the study of the Bible. Surely we have reached the dawn of the golden age of divine revelation!

The outlook is so vast, the land yet to be possessed so rich and limitless, that there can be no room for jealousies, only for a friendly rivalry in doing the utmost to help each the other, of whatever name or nation, to secure the common treasure for the common brotherhood of scholars. It is not a question whether the delver in this mine of sacred wealth is a German, a Frenchman, an Englishman or an American. The question is, What things, new and old, can he contribute to the common stock of biblical learning? For this reason, it would not have been my choice to have limited the present inquiry to such explorers in Bible-lands as happen to be Americans by birth or adoption. Having, however, had the topic assigned me in this shape, it may have a certain advantage in stimulating among us the ambition to do our whole duty in the great work of exploration.

Possibly there was wisdom and blessing in the providential hindrances which made separate exploration societies in America a failure. The world of Christian scholarship is substantially one. Its aim, its subjects of study, its sources of information, its fields of research are common property, to be used for a common end. To divide, is to weaken it. Hope and strength lie in concentration. Territorial lines are constantly fading and the world is growing smaller by

rapid intercourse. What better center for a great international Christian enterprise could there be than London? What better agencies than the "Palestine Exploration Fund" and the "Egypt Exploration Fund"? What better media for interchange of thought and diffusion of newly discovered information than their respective publications? For collection of money, division of labor is helpful, as the recent experience of the "Egyptian Fund" in this country has signally shown; but for all the other purposes of these organizations, there is a great advantage in the communion of kindred minds of all nations, and their co-operation through a common channel.

In attempting to complete our notices, begun in the March number of this magazine, of what Americans have done in the exploration of Bible-lands, we shall not include the work of our distinguished fellow citizens by adoption, Messrs. Schliemann, of Greece, and Cesnola, of Cyprus; because their fields, though properly among Bible-lands, have yielded fruit more properly classical and archæological than scriptural. We have no more than a very modest account to give of personal work by Americans in Egypt or Assyria. The most that we can say is that some Americans have done what they could to send material aid to those who are in the field, and that others by their scholarly investigations and critical studies have contributed to make effective the results of explorations.

One organized attempt has been made to enter the Babylonian field. In the summer of 1884, a small company of biblical scholars, members of the American Oriental Society, held a consultation together on the subject of an expedition to Babylonia, the result of which was an organized plan to send one as soon as means could be obtained. Not long after, a noble-hearted lady, Miss Catherine L. Wolfe, of New York,—the recent close of whose beneficent life has just been announced,—volunteered to defray the whole expense of the expedition. At the same time the services of the Rev. Wm. Hayes Ward, D. D., LL. D., of the *Independent*, were secured as a leader. Dr. Ward sailed for Europe September 6, 1884, and took the overland route to Constantinople, going thence by steamer to Mersin on the Cilician coast, and then by private conveyance to Aintab. His party for exploration consisted of Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett, of Athens, and Mr. J. H. Haynes, of Robert College, Constantinople, who acted as photographer and took charge of the caravan, with five Arab attendants.

The report of the expedition was published by Dr. Ward in the columns of the *Independent*, May 20, 1886, as well as in the "papers of the Archæological Institute of America," under whose auspices the work was finally conducted. The report is intensely interesting as a journal of personal adventures, and contains some matter of considerable value to science, though the brevity of his stay and the hurried nature of the trip rendered original discovery well nigh impossible. There is, however, one suggestion of his which may open the way for a discovery of great importance. This is no less than the possible site of the *Accad* of Gen. x. 10, one of the four oldest cities of Babylonia. This he identifies with a mound called *Anbar*, supposed to be the Anbar of Arabic historians, the *Per-sabora* of classical geographers, and the *Agade*, or *Sippara*, of Anunit.

At the time of its discovery, Dr. Ward and his party were on their homeward route. They had turned aside to examine the mound of *Sufeira*, which had formerly been supposed to be the site of *Sippara* of *Shamash* until this claim had been given up in favor of *Abu-Habba*. This proved to be an inconspicuous mound of no importance; but another mound was mentioned to them, much larger than

Sufeira, several miles off. To this Dr. Ward and his guide repaired, and he was surprised to find a very extensive and elevated mound not laid down on modern maps. It is called Anbar by the natives, and compares very well with the sites of the largest cities of Babylonia. Babylon itself excepted. It is divided in its center by a depression, which may represent an old canal, and which may have separated the old from the new city, and thus, Dr. Ward thinks, may have arisen the dual form of the name Sepharvaim. It stands upon the Euphrates, which agrees with inscriptions which call the Euphrates the river of Sippara.

If future excavations should prove this identification to be correctly made, the discovery will take rank among the most important, and will do great credit to the Wolfe expedition. The special object of Dr. Ward's journey was to open the way for further explorations in the future. It must be confessed that the immediate results in this direction were not abundant. That the field for work is yet very extensive, no one can doubt. Nor can the importance of the discoveries yet to be made be greatly overestimated. Undoubtedly a vast store-house of archaeological treasures lies buried in the mounds of Mesopotamia, and the unexplored regions of Babylonia are especially rich in objects of the greatest antiquity. Unfortunately, however, the difficulties in the way of thorough work in excavation seem to increase rather than diminish as their importance becomes known. The Turkish government, which holds the key to this treasure-house, is not only incapable, even if it were disposed, to do the work; but it is yearly growing more determined to prevent anyone else from doing it. Dr. Ward could get permission to enter the country only upon express condition that no excavations should be attempted. It is the present policy of Turkey to forbid absolutely all excavations of antiquities, whether by natives or foreigners.¹

In spite of the policy and the restrictions of the Turkish government, however, Dr. Ward succeeded in obtaining by purchase a large number of valuable objects embracing several complete barrel-cylinders, or parts of them, belonging to Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, and other kings, and perhaps a hundred complete "contract" and other tablets, a few of a period perhaps fifteen hundred years before Christ, but mostly of a period ranging from Nebuchadnezzar to Antiochus Epiphanes. The "contract tablets," so-called, which formed the larger part of the collection, are those to which we must look for the recovery of the private life of the people. Some of those which Dr. Ward has secured are among the most interesting yet discovered. They are now deposited in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York city. None of them have yet been published; but when they have been properly studied and brought out, it will be seen that, on this account if for no other reason, the Wolfe expedition has well earned the gratitude of biblical scholars. There were also many smaller finds of curious interest, such as small engraved and inscribed objects in gold, chalcedony, lapis-lazuli, and clay, burnt and unburnt. A very important service was also performed by the expedition in photographing the mounds, ruins, excavations, and other scenes which they visited, so that a more definite idea can be obtained of the work and the localities, and by it the facility of illustrating the subject is greatly increased.

Besides this organized effort, there had been performed,—as in the field of Palestine,—some good work in previous years by American missionaries. Dr.

¹ The three preceding paragraphs formed part of an editorial, by the writer of this article, in the *Journal of Education* for July 22, 1886.

Selah Merrill has given, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1875, an interesting account of relics from Assyria sent to this country by missionaries, among which are slabs enough to cover a wall 275 feet long and eight feet high, which are now deposited chiefly in the libraries of New England colleges. In the bibliographical list which follows¹ this paper will be found the names of several who have contributed to the literature of this subject through their own personal explorations.

But it is not to the explorer alone that we are indebted for the contributions to sacred learning which now come, in such rich profusion, from the fields of Babylonia and Assyria. Long before any light dawned upon us from those ancient sources, we were actually in possession of a large part of the material which now proves so luminous. Long before the jealous Turk suspected the value of his buried treasure, the intuitions of science had anticipated the present revelation, and transferred to Christian keeping the precious caskets in which it was concealed. Here, however, it waited for a Grotefend, a Rawlinson, and a Jules Oppert, to find and perfect the key to its decipherment, and now it is to the patient toil of linguistic scholarship more than to the original work of exploration that we owe our present advances in Assyriological science. In this department of the work American scholars are coming to occupy a very respectable position. Already courses of instruction, under competent teachers, have been established in Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, and Madison Universities; in the Union, Newton, and Louisville, and other theological seminaries; as well as in the various summer schools of the American Institute of Hebrew. One American scholar, Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Harvard College, has published, at Leipzig, an edition of the cuneiform inscriptions of Sargon, King of Assyria, after the originals, with a transliteration, translation, glossary and explanations. It contains six inscriptions in autograph, one of which had not been published before, and all of which are improved in accuracy. Dr. Lyon has also published an Assyrian Manual for the use of beginners, which has already gone into use as the text-book in this department. There has also appeared at Leipsic, from the pen of a young American scholar, Mr. Samuel A. Smith, an edition of the Asurbanipal inscriptions, with a translation, commentary and complete glossary.

Egypt, as a field of biblical research, has been much longer before the Christian public than either Assyria or Babylonia, although the most important discoveries there have been comparatively recent. A fair proportion of American travelers have followed the steps of Edward Robinson in taking the pyramids and the desert on their way to Palestine; and some American scholars have kept up their studies of Egyptian archaeology as a part of Old Testament interpretation. One honored name stands prominently forth in this connection. The lamented Dr. Joseph P. Thomson commenced, a quarter of a century ago, a series of notes in the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* on "Egyptology, Oriental Archaeology and Travel," and kept them up, with scarce any interruption, till the close of his life in 1879. They were and still continue to be of great interest and value as contributions to the literature of the subject. They have done much to stimulate American scholars to investigation in this department.

It would be impossible here even to allude to all which American travelers have published about Egypt. The bibliographical list, hereafter to be published, will furnish some glimpse of it. A few recent works, however, seem to require special mention. The Christian public is greatly indebted to the Rev. Dr. H. C.

¹ In the June number of THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Trumbull, of the *Sunday School Times*, for an exceedingly thorough and exhaustive discussion of the true site of Kadesh Barnea, and incidentally of the route of the exodus, which was the fruit of a recent visit of his to Egypt and the desert. We also have, in Prof. H. S. Osborn's "Ancient Egypt in the light of Modern Discovery," a very useful and trustworthy compendium of recent facts in connection with Egyptian exploration.

By far the most important contributions of Americans, however, to the science of Egyptology, have been in the shape of material aid to the "Egypt Exploration Fund." An American clergyman, the Rev. Wm. C. Winslow, LL. D., of Boston, a Vice-President of that society, has done great service to his countrymen by his indefatigable and successful efforts to awaken interest in this important work. Through his correspondence and personal influence a very large number of eminent scholars and distinguished men have had their attention called to this society, and have enrolled their names as members. In this way, during the year 1886, a contribution to the amount of about \$4,000 was sent over to swell the fund and stimulate exploration. At a public meeting held in London last summer, Miss Amelia B. Edwards, the accomplished Secretary of the Fund, paid a very high eulogium to Dr. Winslow, saying that, "with the one single exception of the late Sir Erasmus Wilson, Dr. Winslow had done more than anyone, not merely for the work of this society, but for the cause of biblical research and the spread of biblical knowledge, in connection with Egyptology, throughout the civilized world."

Why is not this method of co-operation as feasible, economical and effective, as any which could be adopted, not only for Egypt, but for Palestine and for all exploration in Bible-lands? And why may not the Christian laymen of America, whose intelligence and liberality in all good undertakings are unsurpassed anywhere in Christendom, be enabled so to appreciate the vital importance of this work as to place it on a substantial basis among the foremost of Christian enterprises?

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

MAY 15. THE CALL OF MOSES. Exod. iii. 1-12.

This lesson is interesting as an instance of a theophanic "appearing" of Jehovah to a man. In verse 2, the person who appears is called "the angel of Jehovah;" he is said to be Jehovah, in verses 4, 7, etc., and is called "God," in verse 4, and "the God," in the close of verse 6. From the analogy of other instances of the same sort, I suppose that we are to understand the author of Exodus as affirming that Jehovah, in the person of "the angel," assumed a human character, for the purpose of making this revelation to Moses. This theophany is like that of Mount Sinai, and unlike most of those in which Abraham participated, in that it was accompanied by a visible miraculous symbol, the burning bush; perhaps it was also like the Sinaitic theophany in that the human character assumed by God consisted entirely in the audible words, without the presence of any visible human form.

From Exod. iv. 19, we may perhaps infer that the incident of the burning bush occurred before the death of Rameses II., the Pharaoh from whom Moses fled, and that, being prepared for his mission by this incident, he was started upon the mission itself by a fresh message from God that came to him in the land of Midian. If this be the case, the forty years of the exile of Moses from Egypt were the last forty years of Rameses; the great battles of the Hittite wars of Rameses had been fought before Moses left Egypt; after he left, occurred the marriage of Rameses with the Hittite princess, and also the wars he carried on to obtain captives to employ on his public works, as well as the construction of most of these works themselves.

In the matter of dates, however, and in the consecutive placing of events, Egyptology is a very puzzling and unsatisfactory branch of learning. Doubtless it will become less so in time. At present, it is most satisfactory when it deals with facts that are comparatively independent of chronological data. For example, we are informed, Acts vii. 22, that "Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." It is now known that the period of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, in Egypt, was rich in its production of literature. It was particularly so in the departments of heroic and religious poetry, ethics, and light literature. For example, much more than half the Egyptian literature published in the five volumes of the *Records of the Past* dates from the times of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, and before the death of Moses. A very large portion of these texts are texts that Moses may have read when they were first published, as new books. The two great literary men of the monuments, the poet PENNAUR and the novelist ENNA may have been schoolmates of Moses; they may have read together the older classics of Egypt.

MAY 22. THE PASSOVER. Exod. xii. 1-14.

The first twenty verses of this chapter, with verses 43-49, are the statement of a law, put into the form of a narrative. Verses 21-28 inform us that Moses, at the juncture of affairs then reached, gave directions to the elders of Israel, publicly assembled, for having the law carried out, and the passover lambs killed. This implies that the law itself had been given at an earlier stage of affairs. But the law, narrative though it is, is not introduced into the longer narrative as a circumstantial clause, by weak *Waw* followed by the subject (for instance, like the circumstance of the Israelites' obtaining contributions from Egypt, xii. 35, 36), but begins as an independent narrative, with *Waw* consecutive of the Imperfect. This and half a dozen similar facts in these chapters are pretty conclusive proof that the anti-traditional critics are correct in holding that this part of Exodus is composite—that it was composed, to some extent and in some way, out of previously existing pieces of writing. The evidence of this from the structure of the narrative is worth vastly more than the verbal trivialities commonly cited for proving the same thing.

On the other hand, however, this evidence from the general structure of the passages does not lend itself to the support of any of the current theories concerning the Priest-code; it does not indicate that this law can be recognized as a part of one of three continuous accounts that have been combined into the present account; on the contrary, it has the same sort of force to distinguish this law from the so-called sections of the Priest-code that precede and follow it, that it has to distinguish it from the other parts of the present narrative. It testifies

distinctly that the writer of Exodus (or some writer of Exodus, if there was more than one) when he reached this point, instead of explaining the situation by writing a new account of the passover feast, made his explanation by transcribing an account that either he or some one else had previously written; and here it ceases to testify. It follows that there is nothing in this part of the evidence to favor the idea of the late origin of any part of the account.

The author of Exodus certainly intended to convey the idea that the Israelites lived mainly in one tract of Egyptian territory—the land of Goshen, *Exod.* viii. 18 (22); ix. 26, etc. He did not intend to convey the idea that they were the exclusive inhabitants of that section. The houses of the Israelites were among the houses of the Egyptians, so that the destroyer would “skip” Israelite houses, in going from house to house among the Egyptians, *xii.* 13, 23, etc. If the Israelites had sacrificed in Egypt, they would have done so in the presence of Egyptian neighbors, who would have stoned them, *viii.* 22 (26). Very generally they had Egyptian neighbors, from whom they could “ask” contributions; not the men only, but the women had such neighbors; it was a case of Egyptian households and Israelite households very generally living in the same neighborhoods, *iii.* 21, 22; *xi.* 2, 3; *xii.* 35, 36. We shall presently find that this fact is significant, both in regard to the passover, and in regard to the facts narrated in our subsequent lessons.

Another statement of similar significance is that made concerning their numbers, *Exod.* *xii.* 37, 38. Translating this in the order of the Hebrew, we have:

“And started the sons of Israel from Raamses Succoth-ward, about 600,000 foot, the men, apart from offspring; a great mixed multitude also having gone up with them, and flock and herd, an exceeding great property.”

The numeral 600,000 is commonly interpreted by the account of the census taken a year later, as now found in *Num.* i., thus making it to be the number of the men over twenty years of age. As it was a census of people who were rapidly increasing, and therefore of people who had large families of children, this would indicate a population nearer three millions than two millions. It is not surprising that, to many, this number appears incredibly large. What is true in this case is true of a large proportion of the census numbers, and of the numbers for military armaments, as given in different parts of the Bible. As the biblical writers hold that, from the times of Moses, Israel was organized under “captains of thousands, captains of hundreds, captains of fifties, and captains of tens,” *Exod.* *xviii.* 25, it would be a fair question to ask, whether, in these large numerals, the “thousands” are not units of organization, rather than strict numbers, and whether there may not have been enough of the “thousands” only partly full, to amount to a material reduction in the total numbers given. But whether we accept views of this kind or not, the population that kept that first passover is certainly represented to have been more numerous than that of an average American state; if the numbers are to be taken strictly, it was as numerous as that of some of our largest states. Irrespective of all questions of Egyptian geography, the writer of Exodus, if he was writing history and writing it intelligently, intended us to understand that this population was scattered over a territory extensive enough so that they could get a living in it. It must have been some thousands of square miles in extent; for however compactly oriental populations may sometimes live, this was a population that was well provided for,

that was addicted to grazing industries, and that shared with other populations the districts where it dwelt.

Now if this account is historical, and if the state of things just mentioned actually existed, and if the account is to be understood without hypothesizing a million of miracles to explain facts otherwise incredible, several inferences follow from it. First, the writer expected his readers to be sufficiently intelligent to understand that the passover law was given early enough to afford time for its promulgation and acceptance over all this territory, among all these people. Again, he intended to convey the meaning either that the final orders concerning the passover, XII. 21, were given to the assembled elders early enough for transmission over all the territory where the people lived, or else that the orders had previously been transmitted in some other way. Again, he meant to be understood that Israel had now become a thoroughly organized body, for the purposes of the uprising, and looked forward to the passover feast as the time for a simultaneous movement.

The passover law that constitutes our lesson does not contradict the statement made in Exod. XII. 34, 39 :

“ And the people took up their dough that was not yet fermenting, their leavening pans bound up with their clothes upon their shoulder. . . . And they baked the dough which they brought out from Egypt, unleavened cakes : for it had not fermented ; for they were expelled from Egypt, and were not able to linger ; and they had not made provision for themselves.”

It is not fair to interpret this to mean that every particular Israelite housewife in Egypt had that afternoon set bread, and that some member of every household started swinging a pan of unbaked dough on his shoulder. If it is a record of fact, it must be regarded, not as describing a universal practice, but an illustrative incident. If this author teaches that Israel generally had put away leaven, in obedience to the divine command, then, perhaps, he here teaches that some who had failed properly to obey the command, were afterward providentially compelled to obey it, and to obey it in a way which signally illustrated its meaning, rather than did credit to themselves. And at all events, whatever this passage means, it certainly is not a second account of the origin of the passover feast, contradicting that previously given.

In fine, there is nothing in any account of the passover contained in the Bible to prevent our regarding the law, as stated in the present lesson, as describing the actual origin of this festival. It is possible, indeed, to put the various accounts together in other ways, especially if one calls in the aid of an interpretation that puts contradictory meanings upon some of them ; but if we allow any weight to the historical statements of the Bible, we must always prefer that view which accepts the statement with which our lesson begins, that this particular law was given to Moses in Egypt, and therefore is the original law of the passover.

MAY 29. THE RED SEA. Exod. XIV. 19-31.

Here again we have an account of a form of theophany, in which the being who appears is called “ the angel of the God,” Exod. XIV. 19, and “ Jehovah ” in the other verses of the narrative, and in which the “ appearing ” is rather by the visible symbol of the pillar of cloud and fire, accompanied by personal divine acts and communications, than by any assumption of a human form.

The Massoretic division at XIII. 17 opens a distinctly fresh section in the literary form of the book. This account presupposes the previous parts of the history, but it starts with a fresh beginning, and from a point of view somewhat changed.

Points of especial interest in this lesson are those which pertain to the route of the exodus, the place and nature of the crossing, etc. But these are so certain to be fully treated by others, that I venture to pass them by.

The account in Exodus seems to be that the children of Israel were in their dwellings, all over the districts of Egypt which they inhabited, at midnight of the fourteenth of Nisan, with closed doors, the passover having been eaten that evening. The passover feast itself, with the death of the first-born of Egypt that followed it, is apparently represented to have been the signal of a movement that was made simultaneously throughout these regions. It is not intimated that any miracle was performed in transporting these multitudes of people, with their flocks and herds, from their homes, all over the thousands of square miles where they lived, to a place of rendezvous. The translations make the Bible to say that the whole 600,000, with the women and children, started together from Raamses; but the Hebrew does not necessarily mean that. Probably the common impression is that the Book of Exodus says that they were all massed together within a few hours, just as they might have been, if there had been only a few hundred of them, from a small tract of country. It is thus that too many of the traditional commentators fill out in their minds the picture outlined in the Scripture; and on this scale they sketch the whole affair till the sons of Israel are safe across the sea. They hold that there were two or three millions of people here, and then treat the account as if it were possible for the millions to move within the same limits of space and time which would limit the movements of thousands. If this filling out of the Bible account were correct, there would be no escape from the conclusions of the critics who say that we have here not a historical account of either natural events or miracles, but merely a grotesque, though perhaps instructive figment of the imagination.

But, if this narrative is history, then the proper filling out of the account is something very different from that just described. If this writer was writing history, then he had in his mind, and intended to convey to other minds, a just picture of the events described. If we supply details from our imaginations for the purpose of enabling us the better to understand the affair, we should supply them in accordance with known facts and possibilities. This author tells us that all Israel went out of Egypt, and apparently that they started from their homes the night after the passover; he does not tell us in how many different bodies they moved, besides the main body, nor on how many different routes, nor how much time elapsed before the last body had crossed the frontier. He gives us a somewhat detailed account of the movements of the main body, who accompanied Moses and the pillar of cloud and fire, and who were, representatively, Israel itself; but whether this main body was composed of nineteen-twentieths of the whole population, or one-twentieth, he does not inform us. As he does not intimate, however, that any portion of this body was transported to the starting-place by miracle, we must infer that it included no more Israelites than could be massed there by ordinary means, within the time available for that purpose. The overthrow at the Red Sea, by breaking the power of Pharaoh so thoroughly that he could no longer interpose obstacles, freed the Israelites who were then still in Egypt, as really as those who crossed the sea with Moses.

JUNE 5. THE MANNA. EXOD. XVI. 4-12.

This article is in danger of exceeding its proper limit of length. On the present lesson, it must confine itself to a single point. What the Bible says concerning the manna is liable to similar abuses of interpretation with what it says concerning the overthrow at the Red Sea. Many comment on this subject as if, during the whole forty years in the wilderness, the Israelites subsisted entirely, or at least chiefly, on manna and quails miraculously given them from heaven,—as if, in this particular case, God undertook to train a race to habits of hardihood by relieving them of all necessity of doing anything to provide for their own needs. As in the case of the descent into Egypt, and the case of the passover and the exodus, we have here a traditional interpretation of the matter which affords a strong position for those who attack the traditional opinions concerning the Bible itself.

To understand what these writings really say in regard to the manna, one should read, not only the passages in which it is directly mentioned, but such as the following: Exod. x. 9; xii. 32; xvii. 3; Num. vii. throughout; Num. xi. 22. etc.; Deut. ii. 6, 28; Num. xx. 19; Lev. xvii. 13; xi. 21-22, 9-10, etc.; the sacrificial laws generally, Exod. xxii. 5, 6, etc.; Num. xiv. 33. He will there learn that Israel in the wilderness had flocks and herds, which were several times in danger of perishing for lack of water, and for which it was proposed to buy water, when they asked leave to pass through Edom; that they left Egypt with money and other commercial resources, and reached Palestine able to purchase such things as they needed; that they are assumed to have resources of hunting and fishing; that the ceremonial law throughout implies their possession, not only of animals for sacrifice, but of agricultural products; that the civil laws contemplate their being engaged in agriculture, as well as in the care of flocks; that what we are accustomed to designate their wandering in the wilderness is actually described as their being shepherds in the wilderness. In fine, these writings represent God's treatment of Israel in the wilderness to have been just what we should expect, in view of the principles on which he ordinarily deals with men. As a rule, he threw them upon their own resources, and thereby trained them; when exceptional needs arose, during the forty years, especially when the need arose from their obeying some especial command which diminished their ability to provide for themselves by ordinary means, then God cared for them by miracle.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Columbia College is to have a chair of Hebrew (Rabbinic) literature. The sum of \$100,000, for this purpose, has been contributed by certain wealthy Jews of New York city.

Dr. Cheyne's new book, "Job and Solomon," noticed in the April *STUDENT*, is published in this country by Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York city. The price is \$2.25, not \$1.25, as announced.

The trustees of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, have voted to establish at once a professorship of oriental languages and literature. This chair will be distinct from that of Old Testament interpretation.

It is but justice to the managing editor of *Hebraica*, to say that the note of Henry S. Morais on Neubauer's "Etymologies" in April *Hebraica*, was inserted only at the earnest request of Mr. Morais, and upon his responsibility, *after his assurance by the editor* that Prof. Neubauer's "Etymologies" were intended as a joke.

If twenty additional subscribers can be obtained, a new edition of *Pithom*, by M. Edouard Naville, of which Prof. Gillett wrote so fully in the January *STUDENT*, will be published. Few works in the line of archæological research have been more interesting. There ought to be a demand for several editions. The matter is in the hands of Rev. Wm. C. Winslow, 429 Beacon street, Boston.

Professor John G. Lansing, New Brunswick, N. J., sails this week for Egypt. While absent, Prof. Lansing will collect material for a work in the line of Arabic literature. His Arabic Manual, recently published, has become the authority in Egypt for missionaries learning the language. Immediately upon his return from Egypt, he will publish an Arabic Chrestomathy and Summary of Syntax, which will serve as a companion-volume to the Arabic Manual.

Much interest, and not a few "warlike" editorials have been inspired by Capt. C. R. Conder's article, "The Old Testament; Ancient Monuments, and Modern Critics," in the March *Contemporary Review*. In the strongest possible manner the writer contrasts the results of monumental research and destructive

criticism, the former every-where substantiating, the latter endeavoring to destroy the credibility of the Bible. Captain Conder selects Wellhausen as the representative of modern critics, and aims to show (1) that Wellhausen himself is ignorant of monumental "facts;" (2) that his hypothesis is constructed without regard to these "facts," and (3) that, in short, these "facts" are in direct opposition to Wellhausen's hypothesis and all similar hypotheses.

This article, as well as the reply to it in the April number by Robertson Smith, is well worth reading. It most certainly contains material of which it will be difficult for the "destructive" critic to make satisfactory disposition. It is not to be forgotten, however, that the arguments are based almost entirely upon linguistic evidence, and that Captain Conder does not pretend to be a Semitic scholar. He uses material second-hand, and, we are sorry to say, does not always choose the best authority. His predilection for Lenormant is too decided. However this may be, it is clear from this discussion that *external* testimony, gathered from the monuments, will hereafter play a more important part in the critical discussion.

Prof. T. Witton Davies, of Haverford Baptist College, South Wales, proposes a Hebrew Institute for Great Britain. In the *Athenæum* of March 19th he reviews the work of the American Institute of Hebrew, and suggests that some such an organization is needed in England. "It could help in the publication of suitable grammars and lexicons; it could see to the issue of good periodicals, keeping students well up with the latest information; it could make it much more possible to produce polyglotts, and other great works involving large outlays, too large for private enterprise to deal with, as the experience of some very strong and respectable firms has proved: it would awaken an *esprit de corps* that would itself be a gain to oriental learning." He suggests that perhaps this Institute would do well to assist in increasing the circulation, size and character of "the already excellent" *Hebraica*, rather than start a Hebrew or Semitic quarterly of its own. In the following number of the *Athenæum* (March 26) Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie makes a short reply which shows that his ideas upon the subject are somewhat vague. A later number contains other letters by Prof. Davies and Mr. Hyde Clark. Something will undoubtedly result from this discussion. It is not periodical and book publishing that our English friends so much need, as *teaching*. The professors in the English Universities have in many cases come to believe that all teaching is drudgery. It is even a great burden to lecture. If a movement could be inaugurated looking to the encouragement of *teaching* the Semitic languages, it would meet with a hearty response from hundreds of men who feel the need of such instruction.

The following "note" was received from Prof. H. P. Smith too late to be placed with his article in a former part of this number:—

"Since the above was sent to the editor I have noticed Cornill's contribution to the same subject in the prolegomena to his Ezekiel. I will quote what he says (pp. 174, 175).

"In chapters XL. to XLVIII. we find for the Hebrew *Adhonay Yahweh* not

Kurios Kurios, but regularly *Kurios ho Theos* 'Lord God.' No commentator has noticed this remarkable fact, or mentioned it; but it gives us an important hint for the comprehension of this section [of the book], and throws unexpected light on the burning problem of Pentateuch criticism. That the *Kurios ho Theos* was not simple guesswork, but the faithful reproduction of the Hebrew text before the LXX. translators, will be readily admitted by those who are well informed. It follows that, in the Alexandrine recension of Ezekiel, the divine name throughout these chapters was *Yahweh Elohim*. That the change is intentional cannot be doubted, and an explanation lies near at hand. In the earlier section of the book *Yahweh* is *Adhonay* 'the Lord;' his relation to Israel is essentially legal. In the last part, on the other hand, he is *Elohim* 'God;' and this relation is a relation of grace. In the time brought before us in chh. XL.-XLVIII. the promise is realized that *Yahweh* will become *Elohim* to them. But this explanation alone is not sufficient; the prophet's intention in this change of names is more significant still. In the present Old Testament there is only one passage in which we meet *Yahweh Elohim*, Gen. II. and III., the history of Paradise. *Evidently Ezekiel would make his vision of the New Jerusalem parallel to this narrative.* Humanity, having ended its cycle of sin and error, returns to its starting-point; the future salvation which follows chastisement is for Israel a new creation, a restoration of the original paradisaic condition, with peace between God and man,—so in substance, although of course in a different form. . . . It follows then, necessarily, that Ezekiel must have read the first chapters of his Pentateuch with the double divine name. Budde's recent assertion, that this must be traced to an inner-jahvistic process, receives this way an unexpected confirmation.'

"The question of an 'inner-jahvistic process' we need not enter upon. The indications that Ezekiel read the early chapters of the Pentateuch as we read them, are very welcome."

➤BOOK ❖ NOTICES.◀

SYRIAN STONE-LORE.*

The many discoveries made within the last quarter of a century, the results of archaeological study during this period, as they stand related to the country of Syria, more especially Palestine, are presented in this book. It is written to answer the question, What is known about Syria outside of the Bible? The peculiar situation of Syria, so closely related to other nations,—Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Asia Minor, Phœnicia,—renders it possible to make use, directly or indirectly, of the large amount of material which has been collected during late years. There are taken up in order, the Canaanites, the Phœnicians, the Hebrews, Jews and Samaritans, the Greek age, the Herodian age, the Roman age, the Byzantine age, the Arab Conquest, the Crusaders. Three maps accompany the work, one of Syria, 1300 B. C., a second of Syria, 500 A. D., and the third of Syria, 1180 A. D. The writer acknowledges freely his indebtedness to other scholars. He seems, however, to lean too heavily on Lenormant, who, at best, and especially in minute matters, is scarcely trustworthy. Comparatively little aid has been drawn from German sources.

It is with “archæology and social conditions, with monuments and customs, rather than with annals and books” that the volume deals. The study of such a work must, of necessity, strengthen one’s belief in the truth and integrity of our biblical literature. Questions, it is true, are sometimes raised which leave one in suspense; but, in general, the Bible is found to be vindicated, so far as it is possible for archaeological criticism to corroborate. There is an apparent conflict going on between the external and internal evidence relating to the character of Old Testament history. Mr. Conder’s work is of the external nature; the literary or higher criticism is of an internal nature. Will both come out at the same place? While Mr. Conder is thought by scholars to be sometimes too hasty in his conclusions, the present work contains little with which the general consensus of opinion would not agree. In his recent attack upon Wellhausen, in the *Contemporary Review*, and in his recent announcement that he has discovered the key to the Hittite inscriptions, Mr. Conder has placed himself in positions from which much will be expected. The desire of every biblical and oriental student should look towards the multiplication of such books as that now under consideration.

ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES IN EGYPT.†

In this interesting volume the author aims to fix the position of Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt’s history. With what dynasty, with what Pharaoh did these patriarchs come into relation? The author has collected much valuable material. A fuller notice of the book will appear later. The plate (p. 287) of Thothmes III., the probable Pharaoh in the time of Joseph, is taken from this book by the kindness of the publishers.

* SYRIAN STONE-LORE, or, The Monumeatal History of Palestine. By Claude Reginer Conder, R. E. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1887. 8vo, pp. 472.

† ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES IN EGYPT. Being a course of lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D., of Philadelphia. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 8vo, pp. 160. Price, \$1.50.



FROM BRITISH MUSEUM.

THOTHMES III.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Die Armen-Verwaltung im alten Israel.* Vortrag, geh. im akademischen Verein für jüdische Geschichte und Litteratur in Berlin. Von D. Cassel. Berlin. 1887. 25 S., gr. 8.
- Commentar zum Buche Judith.* Von A. Scholz. Würzburg: Woerl. 1887. xxii, 114 S., gr. 8M.3.
- Zur Geschichte des Königs David von Israel.* Eine Studie über das Mittelstück des Samuelis-Buch [I Sam. xvi.-2 Sam. viii.]. Von A. Gaupp. Progr. d. Königl. Gymn. Schw. Hall. 1886. 31 S., 4.
- Septuagintastudien: Zur Geschichte der Septina.* Von E. Nestle. Progr. d. kgl. Gymn. Ulm. 19 S., 4.
- Delitzsch's Biblical Commentary on the Psalms.* From the latest edition specially revised by the author. Transl. by D. Eaton. 3 vols. Vol. I. London: Hodder. 1887. 8vo, pp. 5207s. 6d.
- Mistère du viel Testament.* Par le baron James de Rothschild. T. V. Paris: Fermin-Didot10fr.
- Das Buch der Richter und Ruth.* Wissenschaftlich bearb. mit theol.-homilet. Betrachtgn. Von P. Cassel. 2 Aufl. [Lange's Bibelwerk. A. T., 5. Th.]. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klafing. 1887. VIII. 314 S., gr. 8M.3. 60
- Études historiques et critiques sur l'Ancien Testament.* Par E. Le Savoureaux. Avec une préface de M. L.-F. Astié. Paris: libr. Fischbacher. 1887. lxi, 403 p., 85fr.
- L'histoire religieuse d'Israel et la nouvelle exegese rationaliste.* Par M. de Broglie. Paris: au bureau des annales de philosophie chrétienne. 1887. 30 p., 8. Extrait des annales de philosophie chrétienne.
- Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la composition et l'origine du Deutéronome, examen des vues de M. G. d'Eichthal.* Par M. Vernes. Paris: E. Leroux. 1887. 53 p., 81fr. 50
- Haifa: or, Life in Modern Palestine.* London: Blackwood. 1887. 8vo, pp. 3767s. 6d.
- The History of Tithes, from Abraham to Queen Victoria.* By H. W. Clark. London: Redway. 1887. 8vo, pp. 2005s.

ARTICLES.

- The Pharaohs of Egypt.* By G. J. Stevens in N. W. Christian Advocate, March 23, '87.
- The Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings.* By A. H. Kellogg in S. S. Times, April 2, '87.
- History of the Pentateuch Question.* By Prof. Ed. König, ib.

- Fresh Biblical Illustrations.* By Charles S. Robinson, D. D., ib., April 16, '87.
- The Anonymous Egyptian Princesses of the Bible.* By Amelia B. Edwards, Ph. D., ib., April 23, '87.
- Ethics of the Hebrew Scriptures.* By Dr. Andrew P. Peabody in Am. Hebrew, April 15, '87.
- The Kurens of Burmah. I. Their Jewish Traditions.* Ib.
- Biblical Research.* Independent, March 31, '87.
- The "Barrier" of Chaluf.* By C. R. Gillett, ib., April 14, '87.
- A Destructive Criticism that destroys the Critic.* Christian at Work, April 14, '87.
- Art among the Ancient Hebrews.* By Dr. Chotzney in Am. Israelite, April 8, '87.
- The Biblical Account of the Creation.* By Rev. Robert Davey in English Pulpit, June, '86.
- The Old Testament: Ancient Monuments and Modern Critics.* By C. R. Conder in Contemporary Review, March, '87.
- Notes on Arabia Petraea and the country lying between Egypt and Palestine.* By Chas. Warren in Palestine Exploration Fund, Jan., '87.
- Recent Discoveries: Notes and News from the Liva of 'Aeca.* By G. Schumacher, ib.
- Die Bedeutung der Priesterschaft fuer die Gesetzgebung während der zweiten Tempelzerstörung.* Von H. Graetz in Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judenth., '87. 3.
- Ein neugefundenes Kanon-Verzeichniss.* Von J. Weiss in Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol., 30, 2, '87.
- A Hebrew Institute for Great Britain.* By Prof. T. Witton Davies in Athenaeum, March 19, '87.
- A Hebrew Institute.* By Terrien de Lacouperie, March 26, '87.
- The Hebrew (or Semitic) Institute.* By T. Witton Davies and Hyde Clark, ib., April 2, '87.
- Ueber die Schreibart und die Aussprache des göttlichen Eigennamens.* Von E. Hochstädter in Jüdisches Literaturblatt. XVI. No. 11.

REVIEWS.

- Der Autor des masoretischen Werkes Ochlal w' Ochlal (H. Graetz).* Von R. Gershom in Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenth., '87. 1.
- La Bible. I. (E. Ledrain.)* Von W. Nowack in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, April 2, '87.
- Die Bucher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josya (August Dillmann).* By Wellhausen, ib., Apr. 2, '87.
- Das Jahrhundert nach dem babylonischen Exile mit besond. Rücksicht auf die religiöse Entwicklung des Judenthums (Rosenzweig).* In Lit. Centrbl., April 2, '87.
- Ethik der Halacha (M. Bloeh).* By H. Strack in Theol. Litbl., '86, 44; Lit. Ctrbl., '87, 7.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

JUNE, 1887.

NO. 10.

WITH this number THE STUDENT closes its sixth volume. A glance at the contents of this volume shows at least two things:—

(1) It is possible to present the leading subjects of Old Testament study in a form which is at once scholarly yet popular. In certain lines of investigation, where the linguistic element abounds, the more learned style is necessary. But in general, there is no occasion for the employment of the affected style which characterizes much of our “learned” work. A plain straightforward presentation of a subject is entirely consistent with a deep and exhaustive knowledge of that subject. If scholars could but be brought to recognize this fact, how much more wide-reaching the results of their work would be.

(2) It is possible for men who are not specialists to keep abreast of the results accomplished in a given department with the expenditure of a comparatively small amount of time and energy. The great cry, in these days, is for more time; and certainly, in view of the pressure which rests upon us, more time is needed. But the fact is, a judicious use is not always made of the time we have. Men think, and plan, and consider, but do not *act*. The Old Testament subjects about which so much is written, for example, are thought to be too deep, too exacting, for anyone but a specialist to take up. It is true that a certain portion of the work must be done by specialists; but when the results of this work have been put into shape, there is no reason why men who are not specialists should hesitate to enter upon an investigation of them. The work, if but once begun, will be found to be most helpful and stimulating. There is, however, aside from this, a general knowledge of the Old Testament department which every conscientious Bible-student should make an effort to maintain. For such especially THE STUDENT is intended. May the number desiring such help become greater; may the help afforded by THE STUDENT become more valuable.

THE work of Professor Beecher on the Sunday-school lessons during the past year has deservedly attracted much attention. The material has differed essentially, both in plan and execution, from any other. Its striking characteristic has been the rigid application of "common-sense" principles of interpretation. It is not strange that we should bring with us from our childhood a multitude of "childish" ideas about the Bible. And not only we, but our ancestors for many generations, have done this thing. The result is a multitude of misconceptions, of which skeptics naturally, and in some cases most justly, make much capital. With a reverent spirit, and from a conservative point of view, Professor Beecher has endeavored, in the small space at his disposal, to call attention to some of these weak positions. He has, from time to time, pointed out the utter absurdity of some of our most cherished ideas. In this effort to introduce the principle of common sense, to lead us to look at Bible-history from a rational stand-point, he has performed an invaluable service. Destructive critics would take away Bible-history; most conservative critics would treat it as a piece of costly furniture to be handled with gloves, or as an idol to be worshiped. Professor Beecher would treat it as a book describing ordinary life under extraordinary guidance; he would so interpret it as to make it seem to be, what it really is, a sensible book;—a method of interpretation which, when put into general practice, will deliver us, on the one hand, from the blasphemous attacks of unregenerate critics, and on the other hand, from the equally injurious upbolstering of ignorant and fanciful apologists.

Too much must not be expected of American students. Neither the professors nor the clergy of this country are as favorably situated for carrying on original investigations as are those of England or Germany. It is, however, with some feeling of pride that one reads the list of books and articles in the line of exploration which Professor Mitchell gives us in this number of *THE STUDENT*. After all, much has been done. The names of Robinson, Merrill, Trumbull, Ward, and many others, will long be remembered in connection with the work which they have accomplished in this direction. The bibliography of this subject will serve, not only as a convenient reference for students, but also as a stimulus to still greater activity. It is an occasion for regret that the means are not at hand with which to push this work. We need not fear that too much will be done. There is rather a danger that, in our practical and busy life, we shall overlook a work which deals only with the past, and in which a few only, at best, can be actively engaged.

STUDENTS of the Bible will await with much interest Captain Conder's vindication, in view of the charges of ignorance and misrepresentation made by Professor W. Robertson Smith. The sympathies of conservative thinkers are, of course, with Captain Conder. It is interesting to note that the same instrument wielded by Captain Conder has been turned against him. Evidently some one is at fault. But the question is reduced, in the case of their mutual charges, to one of *facts*. (1) Has Conder, in his statement of the results of monumental study, stated facts? (2) Has Wellhausen ignored these facts or shown himself ignorant of their existence? All will agree with Conder in the statement that, "among the chief requisites for a thorough understanding of the Bible, it is important that the critic, in addition to linguistic and literary knowledge, should possess a deep acquaintance with Eastern antiquities and a sympathetic appreciation of Eastern manners and thought." It remains for those versed in these matters to determine who is in the right. The decision will be awaited with much interest.

CONNECTED with this question, another, of peculiar importance from the biblical stand-point, has arisen. For nineteen years much has been made of the Moabite Stone, discovered not far from the Arnon, and claiming to be the epigraph of King Mesha, and to date from about 900 B. C. Only recently there has appeared a critically restored edition of the text, with full notes, by Professors Smend and Socin. But in the *Scottish Review* of April, Rev. A. Loewy, Sec'y to the Anglo-Jewish Association, endeavors to show that the stone, "notwithstanding its world-wide glorification, is nothing but 'a stone of stumbling,' and must be consigned to the limbo of marvelous impositions." A fuller statement will be found elsewhere. A few scholars have held this position from the beginning; but its acceptance as genuine was as universal as is ever expected in such cases. If now it proves to be a fabrication of modern times, the feeling of doubt in the results of modern researches, already considerable in some quarters, will be strengthened. It will, nevertheless, teach the necessity of being on our guard against impositions, of accepting cautiously the claims of specialists in whatever field they may be made, and of drawing our conclusions from their claims with even greater caution. It is altogether probable that Dr. Loewy is mistaken. It will require strong evidence to show that a stone which has been tested with such care and by such experts, is a fraud.

THE article on "Israelitish Politics as affected by Assyrian, Babylonian and Early Achæmenian Kings," by Professor Lyon, will

be read with interest by our readers, although most of them, doubtless, will differ with the author in his conception of the prophet's work. In the past, writers on prophecy have emphasized the divine element in prophecy, and in so doing have almost obliterated the distinction which exists between prediction and prophecy. In other words, the human side of the question has been overlooked. For our own part, we feel the importance of placing an increased emphasis, if that is possible, upon the divine character of this most wonderful phenomenon. The deep and broad study of the subject should most certainly lead to a more decided feeling of its supernatural character. On the other hand, we must not make the mistake of supposing that the prophets were men of another world. They were Israelites, imbued with the religious and political feelings of the men of their time. They were working, as best they could, for the elevation of their fellow-men. They were the moral reformers and, in many cases, the prime-ministers of their day. From this stand-point much light is shed upon their work by a study of the history of the nations with which they came into contact, and by the study of their own history from the political point of view. The article referred to is full of suggestive material. We trust it may have a careful perusal.

A DETERMINED effort is being made looking toward a "proposed school of Biblical Archæology and Philology in the East." The names of the gentlemen who have undertaken the movement furnish a sufficient guarantee not only of its worthiness, but also of its probable success. This school will furnish "a center for instruction and assistance to recent graduates of theological seminaries who wish to pursue special branches; to ministers able to secure a few months vacation; to scholars who have time for more careful and extended investigation; to young men preparing to fill chairs of oriental languages or to become professors in theological institutions; to travelers anxious to do something more than merely make a hurried tour through the Holy Land; to expeditions sent out to undertake explorations in Syria or the adjacent countries; and to all who, in any way, are attempting to gather from the land material for the clearer illustration of the Book." Can there be a doubt as to the gratifying results of an outlay in establishing such a school? We trust that the appeal for funds will receive a prompt and hearty response; and that this new enterprise, full of so much promise, shall soon be thoroughly established. Communications may be addressed to Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, 11 Cliff Street, New York.

ISRAELITISH POLITICS AS AFFECTED BY ASSYRIAN, BABYLONIAN AND EARLY ACHÆMENIAN KINGS.

BY PROFESSOR D. G. LYON, PH. D.,

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

I.

This paper does not claim to be an exhaustive discussion, but only an illustration of the subject. It is not occupied with the exegesis of individual passages, but is an attempt to comprehend and define the larger political relations.

The period of time covered by the title is from the first appearance of Assyrian kings in Israelitish politics in the middle of the ninth century B. C., to the time of the rebuilding of the temple after the return from the Babylonian exile.

I employ the term "Israelitish" not in distinction from Judean, but as including the latter during the whole period under review.

It is impossible, in any study of the topic, to exclude reference to Egyptian politics, because of the important relations between Egypt, on the one hand, and Assyria and Babylon on the other, and because the treatment of Israel by the latter countries was often influenced by Egyptian tactics.

From the Old Testament itself comes most of our material, but it is to the contemporary cuneiform annals that we must frequently turn for the larger interpretation of the facts. The facts themselves are sufficiently familiar to the most casual reader of the Old Testament. In the second Book of Kings we have the record of invasions by the Assyrian kings Tiglath-pileser (xv. 29), Shalmaneser (xvii. 3), Sennacherib (xviii. 13), and by the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar (xxiv. 1). We know that Tiglath-pileser carried many of the people of Gilead, Galilee and Naphtali captive to Assyria (2 Kgs. xv. 29), and received a large bribe or tribute from Ahaz of Judah (2 Kgs. xvi. 8-18).

When Shalmaneser, who was besieging Samaria, died, Sargon, his successor, led the siege to a successful issue, carried the people away and settled them in other Assyrian provinces (2 Kgs. xvii. 6). He then brought other captives from Babylon and the neighboring cities and settled them in Samaria (2 Kgs. xvii. 24).

Sennacherib received large tribute from Hezekiah (2 Kgs. xviii. 14), and according to his own version of the affair, cut off Judean cities and gave them as presents to certain of his Philistine vassals. He also records the transportation of over 200,000 Judeans into captivity.¹

It is recorded of a king of Assyria, whose name is not given, that his officers captured Manasseh and carried him in fetters to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11). The Assyrian kings contemporary with Manasseh were Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, both of whom include Manasseh's name in lists of tributary princes.² The "great and noble Asnapper," who, according to Ezra (iv. 10), settled foreigners in Samaria, cannot, from the form of the name, well be any other than Assurbanipal. His father before him had done the same that Asnapper does (Ez. iv. 2). Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, made successive invasions of Judah, car-

¹ See the account transliterated in my *Assyrian Manual*, pp. 10-12. Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. I., London, 1885, has both transliteration and translation, pp. 280-286.

² See the lists in Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ed. 2, Glessen, 1883, p. 355.

rying off numbers of its inhabitants (2 Kgs. xxiv.), and ultimately destroying Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxv. 9-11).

The Old Testament does not mention Nabonidus, the Babylonian king, whose reign filled most of the space between Nebuchadnezzar and the fall of Babylon; nor does Nabonidus mention Palestine except incidentally, where he refers to the peoples subject to him as far as Gaza, on the borders of Egypt (*Assyrian Manual*, 36, 3). This was at the beginning of his reign. During his wars with Cyrus, the inhabitants of Palestine, no doubt, fell away from him and became tributary to Egypt, or enjoyed a short period of independence.

The captivity in Babylon came to a close in 538 B. C., when the Persian king, Cyrus, on taking the city, proclaimed general amnesty, and permitted all exiles, who so desired, to return to their native land (Ezra i. 1). Cyrus thus became the founder of the new Judean state. Under his successors the rebuilding of the temple, after many interruptions, was at last brought to a happy conclusion, by the favor of Darius (Ezra vi. 7). The new state continued to be a Persian province until it passed under the yoke of the Greeks.

The Assyrian and Babylonian kings appear not only as reducing Israel and as carrying the people captive, but also as receiving tribute, and as deciding questions relating to succession on the throne. Shalmaneser II. received tribute from Jehu in the ninth century B. C., a fact for which we are indebted to his own monuments.¹ Tiglath-pileser relates that he received large tribute from Israel, put Pekah to death and appointed Hosea to be king.² Nebuchadnezzar left Jehoiakim as a vassal for three years on the throne of Judah (2 Kgs. xxiv. 1). After Jehoiakim's death and a brief rule of his son (2 Kgs. xxiv. 8), Nebuchadnezzar appointed a successor, Zedekiah (2 Kgs. xxiv. 17), and it was on the rebellion of the latter that the Babylonians burnt the temple and completely destroyed Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxv.). Between Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar, Judah seems to have been wise enough to bear quietly the yoke of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. After the return from Babylon the Jews were quiet subjects of the Persian power.

II.

The meaning of these repeated invasions, captivities, deportations, from the standpoint of the contemporary prophets is perfectly clear. Israel has sinned against its God, has forsaken his worship for that of other gods, has become cruel, oppressive, proud, immoral. Yahweh, therefore, brings up the Assyrian or the Babylonian as his rod to chastise his rebellious people for their sins. The only salvation is the road of repentance and of trust in Yahweh.

We cannot go amiss in selecting illustrations of the prophetic utterances as to the cause of the calamity which befell Israel. The state is honey-combed with idolatry, and Yahweh is angry. This view of the prophets is maintained through all the troublous period of the invasions.

Isaiah says: "They have rejected the teaching of Yahweh of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel. Therefore is the anger of Yahweh kindled against his people, and he hath stretched forth his hand against them" (v. 24, 25). Yahweh shall hiss for the Egyptian fly and the Assyrian bee (vii. 18) to come and settle in the desolate valley of Israel. "The people hath not turned to him that smote them, neither have they sought Yahweh of hosts. Therefore Yahweh hath cut off from Israel head and tail, palm-branch and rush

¹ See *Assyrian Manual*, p. 8.

² See Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, I. 248. Cf. 2 Kgs. xv. 19-31.

in one day" (Isa. ix. 13, 14). "Ho, Assyrian, rod of mine anger, staff in whose hand is mine indignation. I will send him against a profane nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets" (Isa. x. 5, 6).

The position of Jeremiah is the same. The iniquity of the people is too great to be washed out (ii. 22), there are as many gods in the land as there are cities (ii. 28). The Babylonian invader comes at Yahweh's call (iv. 6), and the only hope is in repentance. "O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved" (iv. 14). If ye do judgment, oppress not, shed not innocent blood, walk not after other gods, "then will I cause you to dwell in this place" (vii. 5-7).

It was a hard office to which the patriotic prophet felt himself called. With other prophets against him (xiv. 13), and with a strong party favoring alliance with Egypt as an escape from Babylon, he continued to preach repentance until he saw that the state of Judah was beyond help, and then he counseled submission to Nebuchadnezzar (xxi. 9). Yea, he even perceives that the only way to remain in the land is by cheerfully accepting Nebuchadnezzar's yoke (xxvii. 1-11). But his warning was unheeded. It was in one of his times of doubt caused by the unstable course of events that he charged his God with deception. "Ah, Lord Yahweh, surely thou hast greatly deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying 'Ye shall have peace;' whereas the sword reacheth unto the soul" (iv. 10; cf. xx. 7; Ezek. xiv. 9). When the city actually fell, Jeremiah was looked upon as an ally by the Babylonian general and was treated accordingly (xli.).

Ezekiel accepts the captivity as a matter of course. The sins of the people have rendered it necessary. Yahweh in his anger has made the land subject to Nebuchadnezzar. The king of Judah provokes Yahweh by breaking the oath of allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar, and by seeking alliance with Egypt (xvii. 11-21).

In the Second Isaiah, the greater part of which belongs at the close of the captivity, a different tone is adopted. The fires of affliction have purged Israel's sins. Babylon has been haughty, is idolatrous and cruel, and shall be brought down (xliii. 14). Cyrus is to desolate the city and destroy its gods (xlv.-xlvii.).

Similar is the tone of the last two chapters of our Book of Jeremiah, which are supposed to belong to a later date and to a different writer.

The attitude of the contemporary prophets is also that of the historians of the Assyrian and Babylonian invasions. Yahweh's anger and rejection of his people is brought out with great frequency and power in the second Book of Kings. Because of their idolatry "Yahweh was very angry with Israel and removed them out of his sight" (2 Kgs. xvii. 18). "Through the anger of Yahweh did it come to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence" (2 Kgs. xxiv. 20).

If the captivity was an expression of Yahweh's anger, the return was the expression of his reconciliation. In Chronicles (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22), Ezra (i. 1), and the Second Isaiah (xlv.), we are expressly informed that Yahweh had raised up Cyrus for this definite task. The message of the prophet to Cyrus is: "For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel, my chosen, I have called thee by thy name" (Isa. xlv. 4). Cyrus is Yahweh's shepherd who shall cause Jerusalem to be rebuilt.

How the prophets may have attained to the conviction that the political hopes of the people depended on a moral reformation and on the purity of Yahweh worship, I will not here inquire. Nor will I discuss the means by which they hoped to escape from their enemies in case of reformation. Isaiah and

Jeremiah would seem to have expected immediate divine intervention. Yahweh would turn the foe aside if the people would sincerely repent. We must remember that the great prophets were statesmen as well as moral reformers. And in the end both Jeremiah and Ezekiel came to see that Israel was too small a power to maintain itself between two such giants as Babylon and Egypt, and they had reason to believe that the land had more to hope from the former than from the latter. There must have been seasons when the prophets seriously doubted the correctness of the message which they proclaimed. How otherwise could they charge Yahweh with deceiving them and the people?

In the view taken by the Hebrew prophets and historians of Israel's foreign relations we must recognize the influence of the thought of that age and the limitations which belong to every attempt to refer to the divine being *special* momentous events. That it belonged to the age to consider national calamity as the work of the deity, is abundantly illustrated in the contemporary cuneiform annals and elsewhere. Esarhaddon tells us that Babylon had been destroyed by his father, on account of the anger of Marduk, the god of Babylon, and that he rebuilt the city when the anger of its god was appeased.¹ Assurbanipal makes repeated mention of pacifying the anger of the gods by visiting punishment on the enemies of Assyria.² Nabonidus says that the moon-god was angry with his city Haran and gave it over to destruction.³ In an inscription of Cyrus we learn that Marduk rejected Nabonidus for impiety and chose Cyrus because of his pure hands and clean heart.⁴

As to the danger connected with *special* attempts at interpretation of providence, illustrations in our day are familiar. Railroad accidents on Sunday are sometimes declared to be judgments for a violation of the Lord's day. An earthquake or a great fire, devastating a city and costing many lives, is believed to be the voice of God expressive of his displeasure. This idea is so often inculcated in the Old Testament and has become such a part of our mental equipment, that we can scarcely divest ourselves of its influence, even after our reasons have laid it aside. True, Jesus has told us that those whose blood Pilate mingled with the sacrifice, and those on whom the tower of Siloam fell, were not sinners above all other men (Luke XIII. 1-5), but we are slow to appropriate the higher teaching. Of course, I do not deny a causal relation between sin and suffering. I only affirm that it is a narrow and harmful view of providence which refers to the divine anger special misfortunes, instead of trying to find out their natural causes.

But, notwithstanding their special, local, temporary explanation of the foreign relations of Israel, the prophets have left us the means of forming just conclusions as to what those relations were. Nor will we cavil at the prophets for the interpretation which they have given. Their ideal was a noble one, and they enforced it by the vigorous use of such material as they possessed. A higher morality and fidelity to one God—this was the essence of their preaching. The further teaching that obedience to the national God will always bring political prosperity, while disobedience will as surely bring political disaster—this is but the temporary argument by which they hoped to secure the reformation of character.

¹ Cuneiform account in *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, I., p. 50, col. I, l. 19, col. II., l.

15.

² *Assyrian Manual*, p. 26, l. 27.

³ *Assyrian Manual*, p. 35, ll. 7-11.

⁴ *Assyrian Manual*, p. 40, ll. 5, 6, 12, 20.

III.

In the light of what we now have from Assyrian and Egyptian sources, we are permitted to take a more comprehensive view than was possible for the prophets. I pass now to illustrate this subject specially from the Assyrian and Persian point of view.

From the time when Assyria first appears in the west, it is not for Israel's sake, nor is Israel the objective point. Extension of territory was the ruling passion of Assyria. The Mediterranean coast was from the most ancient times an inviting field for the conqueror. Already one of the earliest Babylonian kings, Sargon of Akkad, boasts of his successes in that region, and we have in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis reminiscences of another invasion.

The reason why this was chosen territory for the Assyrians of the period under consideration was partly geographical. The nations living east and north in the mountains were more difficult to deal with, and no permanent grasp seems ever to have been laid upon them. Success was easier among the people in the west, who were devoted to the gentler arts of peace. Add to this the fact that the west offered a more promising field for booty, and we have the reason why the Assyrian arms became the scourge of the region west of the Euphrates.

So long as it stood, the powerful kingdom of the Hittites was a partial barrier, acting as a shield to Damascus, the wealthy Phœnician and Philistine cities, Israel and the country to the south-west. Commerce and victories had made these peoples rich, and with the fall of the Hittites the presence of the Assyrian arms and officials became the rule, not the exception.

The Israelitish states were, of course, from the stand-point of the Ninevite statesmen comparatively unimportant. The Assyrian kings were burning to measure arms with the representatives of a civilization older than the Israelitish, that on the banks of the Nile.

With the fall of Carchemish, the position of Israel became different. So long as the Hittite empire stood intact, Israel was comparatively safe. When the intervening governments should fall into the hands of Assyria, Israel's turn would inevitably come. Ahab was aware of this, and sent accordingly 2,000 chariots and 10,000 troops to join a great coalition headed by Damascus against the invader. Hamath, Arvad, Ammon and even Egypt entered the coalition. So far as the numbers are preserved, there were about 75,000 soldiers, besides chariots and horse. The result of the battle was disastrous to the allies. They lost 14,000 troops, besides the military stores, chariots, etc.¹ Wars nearer home prevented the Assyrians from reaping the full benefit of the victory.

The battle does not seem to have led to permanent results, though one of its fruits is that Jehu, of Israel, subsequently appears as tributary to the king who crushed the coalition.² The shattered monarchies retrieved their fortunes and were able to make opposition when the Assyrian raiders re-appeared in the west. Ahaz of Judah was short-sighted enough to welcome the approach of Tiglath-pileser, even going to pay court to him at Damascus (2 Kgs. xvi.), because he hoped by the advance of the Assyrians to see his northern enemies humbled, Israel and Syria. Isaiah had a keener vision, and told Ahaz that Judah's woes through the Assyrian king should far exceed anything suffered from Syria and Ephraim (Is. vii.).

Both Tiglath-pileser and Sargon carried large numbers from Israel into cap-

¹ See account in Schrader's *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, pp. 183-187.

² *Assyrian Manual*, p. 8.

tivity, the latter so many that the northern kingdom ceased to exist. It was now in part re-peopled by captives from Babylonia, and the whole reduced to an Assyrian province. The reigning house or some native prince might have been allowed to continue in Samaria if the statesmen of the period had been better discerners of the signs of the times. There were, perhaps, in Samaria, prophets and others who were advising the same course that Isaiah was urging in Jerusalem, repentance and resistance. It was a grand opportunity to preach reform; but resistance was the one course most sure to exasperate Assyria. If Israel had paid its annual dues, as under Jehu and Menahem, the nation would not have been lost to history, and much of the ingenious conjecture as to the fate of the ten captive tribes might have been spared the world.

We now know that the policy of deportation was a favorite one with Assyrian kings for incorrigible subjects. The annals of Tiglath-pileser, Sargon, Sen-nacherib, Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal are full of illustrations. But the people thus carried off were those who offered stout resistance and would not bear the new yoke. The captives coming into utterly new relations, torn from all national and local associations, settled in colonies among peoples of new customs and strange tongue, the leaders subjected to toil on the great national works of Assyria, temples, palaces and canals,—the captives passing through this experience lost more easily the national spirit and learned to identify their own interests with those of their captors.

The more politic nations understood the state of affairs, quietly yielded, paid tribute to Nineveh, and enjoyed peace and protection at home. The Assyrian yoke was often so mild that the subject people knew little of it beyond the annual collection of taxes.

IV.

When Samaria went into captivity, Judah was left in a unique and uncomfortable position. It and the Philistine cities were all that remained as a partial cover to Egypt against the advancing columns of Assyria. The Egypt of that time had no desire to enter into open conflict with her ancient foe. She had less of recent experience in the art of war than the Assyrians had, and could show no such record of great victories and growing domain. Her policy, therefore, was to bolster up the little states of Judah and the Philistine cities, and to encourage a resistance which could only delay, not ward off disaster. She had her emissaries at the Judean court, and a strong party considered an alliance with Egypt as a possible means of escape. Against this party Isaiah (cf. XIX. and XX.) and afterwards Jeremiah warned the people (Jer. XLII. 19). Not the help of Egypt, but Yahweh alone can rescue Judah. No reliance can be placed in Egypt, for Yahweh has determined that she also shall be led away by the Assyrians.

We have an interesting commentary on these utterances of the prophets in Sargon's account of a campaign against certain Philistine cities and Egypt. On the defeat of the allies, the Egyptians fled and left Gaza to its fate, and the Egyptian Pharaoh paid his tribute to the conqueror.¹ There was in the Philistine cities a strong Assyrian party, and the land bowed in submission. Sargon nowhere records the capture of Jerusalem, but does say that he subjected Judea.² It is probable that this only means that he acquired possession of a large part of the territory, but not that he laid his hands on the capital. Had he done so, the city would have paid dearly for its resistance.

¹ Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, p. 396.

² *Assyrian Manual*, p. 9, l. 14.

Times went from bad to worse when Sennacherib came to the west. It was necessary to reduce again the Philistine cities whom Egyptian intrigues had induced to rebel. Egyptian and Ethiopian allies were defeated in open battle, and the fate of Jerusalem trembled in the balance. The reigning prince, Hezekiah, paid his tribute, but did not open the city gates. Sennacherib desired specially to reduce the city because it was a hot-bed of insurrection, and would be an unpleasant foe to have in the rear while the Assyrian army was penetrating into Egypt. When the city was on the border of despair, the siege was raised, partly, perhaps, because the victory over Egypt had been won at great cost, and partly because affairs nearer home called for the presence of Sennacherib and his army. But in retiring he left Judah weaker than he found it. Though unable to dislodge Hezekiah, he carried off more than 200,000 Judean subjects, and reduced the size of the land by giving much of its territory to the re-established Assyrian vassals in Philistia.¹ To what extent Hezekiah may have regarded himself as also a vassal we do not know.

His son and successor, Manasseh, understood his own relations to Assyria. The repeated invasions in the west had not been unavailing. There are still occasional insurrections, but with such interruptions all of Syria, as far as the confines of Egypt, has now become Assyrian territory. Manasseh, of Judah, appears in a list of twenty-two kings, including those of Tyre and Edom, Moab, Ashkelon, Ekron, Ashdod, as tributary to Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib, and also to Assurbanipal, the son of Esarhaddon. It seems remarkable that no Old Testament historian should have preserved for us any account of this period of subjection. It is true that they tell us of Manasseh's sins, of his capture and transportation to Babylon, of his prayer to Yahweh, and of his restoration to his throne (2 Chron. XXXIII. 11 seq.). But they preserve no details of the period of vassalage. In the light of the monuments, this capture and restoration is but an illustration of what we know to have been a favorite policy of the Assyrian kings. They often restored captive princes, first causing them to swear life-long fealty. It was an Assyrian officer, and not the king himself, who carried Manasseh to Babylon. It no doubt appeared, on investigation there, that he was not so turbulent as the officer had thought. We may suppose that his offense was withholding his dues to Assyria, which was a practical renunciation of the Assyrian yoke. But here the offense belonged, perhaps, less to him than to his advisers. (I have treated this narrative as historical, though I am aware of grave suspicions regarding its historical character.)

With the Philistines and the Judeans now helpless vassals, Esarhaddon could carry out unhindered the long cherished Ninevite project of invading Egypt. The campaign was crowned with success, and the land was divided into twenty provinces, over each of which an Assyrian governor was placed.²

Owing to intrigues and invasions from Ethiopia, Assurbanipal found it necessary early in his reign to advance against Egypt in order to restore the government which his father had set up. He tells us that on this expedition the twenty-two faithful vassals of Syria, both the coast dwellers and those of the interior, furnished soldiers to march with his own by sea and by land for the invasion of Egypt.³ There can be scarcely a doubt that Manasseh was one of the twenty-two, and thus we have a reversal of the times when Judah fought by the side of Egypt against Assyria.

¹ See the whole account in *Assyrian Manual*, pp. 10-12.

² *Assyrian Manual*, pp. 42-47.

³ *Assyrian Manual*, 42, 18.

Except once, in a list of tributaries already quoted, Assurbanipal never, to my knowledge, mentions Judah or Manasseh. The reason is obvious. Jerusalem was a quiet subject, and hence there was no occasion to mention it. Even in the great insurrection occurring about 650 B. C., Judah seems to have been true to her master; for though he mentions Arabia and various cities of the Mediterranean coast whom he found it necessary to chastise, he says nothing about Judea.

V.

With Assurbanipal, the great period of Assyrian supremacy came to a close. In the convulsions belonging to the time of the fall of Nineveh, Jerusalem may have had a short breathing space, in which she was left in uncertainty what course to pursue. The question before her was whether she should bow to the new Babylonian monarchy, or should again risk her fortunes with Egypt. It would have been possible, for a while, to remain neutral, and thus to see to which of the two great contestants she properly belonged. Egypt evidently, for the present, cared little about Judah. She would first measure arms with the new Babylonian power. Judah was but one of the prizes.

But with strange fatuity Josiah chose to resist the advance of Egypt, and consequently lost his life at Megiddo (2 Kgs. xxiii. 29). He had learned too well the lesson of subjection to Assyria and Babylon. Necho pressed his arms to the Euphrates, and all Syria thus fell into his hands. On his return from the expedition, he deposed one son of Josiah and placed another son on the throne at Jerusalem, putting the land to a tribute of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold (2 Kgs. xxiii. 33). So affairs continued for some years, when the young and vigorous Nebuchadnezzar set about the task of recovering his lost provinces and of reducing again his hereditary enemy, Egypt.

Judah was now put to worse straits than ever before. There were three parties, the Babylonian, the Egyptian, and the national. The first favored submission to Babylon, the second to Egypt, the third insisted on independence. But the sight of Nebuchadnezzar's archers under the walls of Jerusalem was more than the Egyptian vassal could endure, and he bowed his head to the yoke. It would have been well for him and for his people, politically speaking, if he had been content to be a servant to Nebuchadnezzar.

Nebuchadnezzar was one of the most pious and mild of all the Assyrian and Babylonian sovereigns. While a skillful warrior, he cared more for building and adorning temples, for beautifying Babylon and for constructing great canals, than for the clash of war. An increase in the daily sacrifice gave him more pleasure than the slaying of a rebel. His leniency toward Jerusalem is worthy of all praise. When Jehoiakim submits, Nebuchadnezzar leaves him quietly on the throne. When he revolts, the Babylonian army comes again; "surely at the commandment of Yahweh," writes the historian, "came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did" (2 Kgs. xxiv. 3).

It was no unusual severity when Nebuchadnezzar, on capturing the city again, carried the new king and 10,000 of the prominent citizens, together with the treasures of the temple, to Babylon. We read of no executions and no conflagrations. He puts a new vassal on the throne and makes Judah again a Babylonian province. Such treatment is a beautiful contrast to the way in which Saul or David would have dealt in similar circumstances.

But again the vassal rebels. This time Nebuchadnezzar did not come in person. But his general was, perhaps, acting under instructions in burning the temple and the dwellings, breaking down the walls of the city, and carrying away most of the people except the poorer farming class. The governor who was appointed over this remnant, together with his body-guard, was slain by some zealots.

We need not follow the fortunes of the Jews in exile further than to note that Evil-Merodach seems to have treated the rebel Jehoiachin with far more clemency than could have been expected (2 Kgs. xxv. 27).

The Assyrian policy, perpetuated by the Babylonians, has prevailed. Israel has vanished, lost in the confusion of the nations. Judah pines in the land of bondage. What does all this mean? Sargon and Nebuchadnezzar say: Assur, or Marduk, has given to me the empire of the world and commanded me to transport all nations who would not bear the yoke of my gods. The prophets of Judah say: Yahweh is angry with his people on account of their sins and drives them from his presence for their chastisement. Such claims are the attempts made from different points of view to comprehend great world-movements then going on. The positions of the Assyrian and the Jew are essentially the same. They differ only in the name of the god to whose decision the events are referred.

With a dispassionateness impossible to participants in the great drama, and with a perspective which they could not have, we may now comprehend the natural causes governing Israel's relations to Assyria. While firmly believing in God's guidance of the nations, we do not find that the Assyrian or the Jewish view aids us in understanding the relations of these peoples.

The best help to an understanding of the political fortunes of Israel is a due appreciation of the geographical position of Israel between the two great world-powers, Assyria-Babylonia on the one hand, and Egypt on the other.

VI.

With Cyrus came a great change. He had been hailed by a prophet of the exile as the one who should utterly destroy Babylon, and break to pieces her idols. Not so did he come, but as a prince of peace. Babylon was left intact. Its inhabitants, who were tired of the reigning king, received the Persian conqueror with open arms. He sent to their shrines the many gods which had been collected into Babylon. He aided numerous captives, of whom Babylonia was now full, to return to their homes. He made ample provision for the sacrifices to the gods not only at Babylon, but in various Babylonian centers of religion. The reason for all this, as he informs us, is that Marduk, the great god, has commanded him to do so, and has given to him the dominion of the world.¹

The Jews are treated like the other captives. This we learn, not directly from Cyrus himself, but from the Old Testament. It was a great event for the Jews, a season of joy unspeakable. How shall they account for it? Surely it is the work of Yahweh. For this very purpose he has raised Cyrus up.

Those who offer this explanation may not have known that Cyrus was doing no more for them than he was doing for other peoples. But if any of the influential Jews were admitted to an interview with Cyrus, he would have been quite capable of saying that Yahweh had raised him up for this purpose. He was not very fastidious in his religion. In his view, not one god, but many gods were his

¹ *Assyrian Manual*, pp. 39-41.

friends, and he might easily have believed that Yahweh's blessings had attended him in order that he might aid the people devoted to the worship of Yahweh.

But the value of the Cyrus inscription, which was just referred to (note p. 301), is that it helps us to comprehend how it was that the Jews came back from captivity. It was not at all exceptional, but was only one act in a great new policy inaugurated by Cyrus. It was a matter of state-craft. By mildness and benefits he would win the peoples whom Babylonian kings had not won by deportations.

With the return the new state became a Persian province. All the dictates of gratitude and of prudence demanded that it should be so. As a Persian province, great works could be undertaken or prosecuted only by the express permission of the Persian governor or king. But it is not my purpose to pursue the subject beyond the period of the return.

The brief sketch which has been presented shows that, during the long period from about 750 to 500 B. C., Assyria, Babylon, and Persia decide the destiny of Israel. It was an eventful period of tuition and of growth, in the main a time which tried men's souls and which must have seemed to many a thoughtful mind hopelessly dark. The prophets, in keeping with the thought of their time, referred every event in the national life to the pleasure or the anger of the national god. We can but admire them for their deep earnestness and their high moral standard. Their interpretation of current events was the only one possible to their time. It is true that, by the side of their particular, local, national interpretation, we have occasional statements of the nobler belief that over all nations there is one God ever executing his own eternal purposes. But, in general, the Yahweh of the prophets before the Babylonian captivity must not be confounded with God. The Hebrew Yahweh is indeed the deity from whom our conception of God has been largely developed. But God is now a fuller idea than Yahweh was, means indeed so much more that one can be contrasted with the other. Yahweh loves Israel and destroys Israel's enemies; God loves all men and hates none. Yahweh's regard to other nations was conditioned on their relations to Israel. God loves the Greek and the Roman as really as he does the Hebrew. The feeling for beauty and the feeling for law, embodied in Greece and Rome, are no less implanted by God, and developed by his providences, than the feeling for religion, which was so marked a characteristic of the Jewish mind, and to which is largely due the best civilization of to-day.

It is hardly necessary to add that there can be no question as to Israel's great and special mission in the world. Such question is impossible in regard to a people who could produce poets like the psalmists and preachers like the prophets, and whose religion could blossom into Christianity. The nation was under providential guidance, but so were Assyria and Egypt, Greece and Rome. Israel's history may be called unique, not as if it had been directed by God while other nations were destitute of such direction, but because it was guided by him in order to fulfill a specific mission. Other nations were entrusted with the fulfillment of other equally specific missions. In this sense every nation has a unique history. But notwithstanding this uniqueness, every nation is but a part of the great whole; and we must expect, in the phenomena of the national life, to see those natural laws under which the nations develop and fulfill their missions.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF EXPLORATION.

A LIST OF AMERICAN WRITERS UPON BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE WORK OF EXPLORATION IN BIBLE LANDS, WITH THE SUBJECTS THEY HAVE DISCUSSED, INCLUDING REVIEW AND MAGAZINE ARTICLES AS WELL AS SEPARATE BOOKS.

BY PROF. E. C. MITCHELL, D. D.,

Cambridge, Mass.

- Abbott**, Rev. Jacob. *Memoirs of the Holy Land. Harper's Monthly*, v. 289-303, 433-450, 577-596, 721-738; vi. 145-160, 289-299; vii. 577-598; viii. 1-17. 1852-53.
- *Memoir of Babylon. Harper's Monthly*, xxxvi. 162-181.
- Abbott**, Lyman, D. D. *Recovery of Jerusalem. Harper's Monthly*, xliii. 195-206. 1871.
- *Home Life in the East. Harper's Monthly*, liii. 695-704. 1876.
- Adams**, Mrs. G. M. *A Ride through the Holy Land. N. Y.*, 1875.
- Alden**, Henry Mills. *Cradle Lands* (Review of an account of them by Lady Herbert). *Harper's Monthly*, xxxvi. 701-718. 1868.
- Alexander**, J. H. *Mountains of Palestine. N. Y.*, 1870.
- Anderson**, Henry James, M. D. *Geological Reconnaissance* (attached to Lieut. Lynch's official report of the U. S. Exploring Expedition to the Dead Sea). Washington, 1852.
- Bacon**, Leonard Woolsey, D. D. *Layard's Discoveries* (Review of Layard's *Nineveh*). *New Eng.*, xi. 457-470.
- Badger**, Lucius Franklin. *The Assyrian Eponym Canon and the Chronology of the Bible. Old Testament Student*, v. 388-394. 1886.
- Bainbridge**, Lucy Seaman. *Round the World Letters*. Boston, 1881.
- Banvard**, J. *Description of Pilgrimage to Jerusalem. N. Y.*, 1853.
- Barclay**, James Thomas, M. D. *City of the Great King. Phil.*, 1858.
- Barrows**, Elijah Porter, D. D. *Sacred Geography and Antiquities. With maps and illustrations. N. Y.*, 1872.
- Bartlett**, Samuel Colcord, D. D., LL. D. *From Egypt to Palestine* (a journey made in the winter of 1873-4) through Sinai, the Wilderness, and the South Country. *Observations of a journey made with special reference to the history of the Israelites. N. Y.*, 1879.
- Bellows**, Henry Whitney, D. D. *The Old World in its New Face, 1867-68. N. Y.*, 1868.
- *Egypt. Old and New*, i. 71-74.
- Bird**, Rev. Isaac. *Bible Work in Bible Lands. Phil.*, 1872.
- Bonner**, John. *The Dead Sea, Sodom and Gomorrah. Harper's Monthly*, x. 187-193. 1855.
- Brace**, Charles Loring. *Egyptian Monotheism. New Princeton Rev.*, i. 346-361. 1886.
- Brigham**, Rev. Charles Henry. *The Holy Land. (A review of Tent Life in the Holy Land, by Wm. C. Prime, as well as of two other works.) Christian Examiner*, lxiii. 211-230. 1857.
- *Geography of Palestine. (A review of Ritter's Comparative Geog. of Palestine as translated by W. L. Gage.) Christian Examiner*, lxxxii. 282-299.
- *Lectures on Palestine. Monthly Rel. Mag.* xiii. 82-90, 145-153, 181-190, 256-264, 301-309; xiv. 11-19, 121-129, 181-189, 324-332; xv. 43-52, 151-159, 325-333, 420-429; xvi. 91-100, 183-191. 1855-58.

- The Jews in Palestine. *North Am. Review*, xcv. 331-354. 1862.
- Ritter's Geography of Palestine (Reviewed). *North Am. Review*, civ. 636.
- The Samaritans. *Unitarian Review*, iv. 141-159.
- Brown, Francis, Ph. D., D. D.** Assyriology; its Use and Abuse in Old Testament Study. N. Y., 1885.
- The Sabbath in the Cuneiform Records. *Presbyterian Review*, iii. 688-700. 1882.
- The Hittites. *Ibid.*, vii. 277-303. 1886.
- Brown, Henry Armitt.** From Jaffa to Jerusalem. *Lippincott's Mag.*, iv. 546-551. 1869.
- Brown, John Ross.** Yusef; or, the Journey of the Frangi. A crusade in the East. N. Y., 1853.
- Bryant, William Cullen.** Letters from the East: Visit to Egypt and Palestine. N. Y., 1869.
- Bulfinch, Stephen Greenleaf, D. D.** Palestine and the Jewish People. Boston, 1852.
- The Holy Land. Camb., 1834.
- Burrage, Henry Sweetser, D. D.** Ordinance-Survey of Jerusalem. *Baptist Quarterly*, ii. 156-161. 1868.
- Burt, Nathaniel Clark, D. D.** The Land and its Story; or, the Sacred Hist. Geog. of Palestine. N. Y.
- The Far East. Letters from Egypt, Palestine, and other lands of the Orient. Illustrations and maps. N. Y., 1869.
- Carpenter, Joseph Estlin.** Art and Literature in Egypt at the time of the Exodus. *Unitarian Review*, iv. 441-470. 1875.
- Cass, Gen. Lewis, LL. D.** Remarks on Stephen's Incidents of Travel in Egypt, Arabia Petraea, and the Holy Land. Cambridge, 1839.
- Cesnola, General Louis Palma di.** Cyprus; its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A narrative of researches and excavations during ten year's residence in that island. N. Y., 1885.
- Charles, Mrs. Elizabeth.** Wanderings over Bible Lands and Seas. Nashville, Tenn., 1873.
- Clark, Rev. William.** Armenian History. *New Englander*, xxii. 507-529.
- The Kurdish Tribes of Western Asia. *New Englander*, xxiii. 28-49.
- Clarke, John Caldwell Calhoun.** The Origin and Varieties of the Semitic Alphabet, with specimens. 2d ed. Morgan Park, 1884.
- History in Alphabets. *Bib. Sac.*, xxxi. 333-354. 1874.
- Clemens, Samuel Langhorne.** The Innocents Abroad; or, the new Pilgrim's Progress. Excursion to Europe and the Holy Land (1867). By Mark Twain. Hartford, Conn., 1870.
- Coleman, Lyman, D. D.** An Historical Geography of the Bible. Phil., 1849.
- An Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography. Phil., '72.
- Palestine and the Desert, past and present. *Bib. Sac.*, xxi. 752-786. '64.
- The Great Crevasse of the Jordan and of the Red Sea. *Bib. Sac.*, xxiv. 248-262. 1867.
- Cook, Joseph.** Orient. Lectures on Palestine, Egypt and the future of Islam. Boston, 1887.
- Cox, Samuel Sullivan.** Orient Sunbeams; or, From the Porte to the Pyramids by way of Palestine. N. Y., 1882.
- Craig, J. A.** Throne-Inscription of Salmanassar II. *Hebraica*, ii. 140-146. 1886.
- Crosby, Howard, D. D., LL. D.** Lands of the Moslem. A narrative of oriental travel. By El-Mukattem. N. Y., 1851.
- The Progress and Prospects of Oriental Discovery. *Princeton Rev.*, xlvii. 476-493.
- Curlis, George William.** Nile Notes of a Howadji. N. Y., 1851.

- The Howadji in Syria. N. Y., 1855.
- Cuyler, Theodore Ledyard, D. D. From the Nile to Norway and homeward. N. Y., 1882.
- Day, George Edward, D. D. Brandis on the Assyrian Inscriptions and the mode of interpreting them. *Bib. Sac.*, XIV. 413-425. 1857.
- De Normandie, James. Sketches of Egypt and Palestine. *Monthly Rel. Mag.*, XXXIX. 453-463; XL. 45-58, 133-143, 211-432; XLI. 229-239, 369-384.
- De Forest, Henry Alfred, M. D. Climatology of Palestine. *Bib. Sac.*, I. 221-224.
- Notes of a Tour in Mt. Lebanon and to the eastern side of Lake Hûleh. *Journal of Am. Orient. Soc.*, II. 237.
- Notes on Ruins in the Bûka'a and in the Belâd, Ba'albeck. *Ibid.*, III. 351.
- De Forest, John W. Oriental Acquaintance; or, letters from Syria. N. Y., 1856.
- De Haas, Frank S., D. D. Recent Travels and Explorations in Bible Lands. N. Y., 1880.
- Dorr, Benjamin, D. D. Notes of travel in Egypt, the Holy Land, Turkey and Greece. Phil., 1856.
- Dalles, John Welsh, D. D. The Ride through Palestine. Phil., 1882.
- Durbin, John Price, D. D. Observations in the East, chiefly in Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Asia-Minor. N. Y., 1845.
- Dwight, Harrison Gray Otis, D. D. Armenian Traditions about Mt. Carmel. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, V. 1853.
- Edwards, E. F. [From] Cairo to Jerusalem. *Catholic World*, XXII. 529-541. 1876.
- Elliot, Charles Wyllys. Remarkable Characters and Places of the Holy Land. With articles from Theodore D. Woolsey. Illust. Hartford, 1869.
- Emerson, Caleb. Robinson's Travels in Palestine and Arabia. *North Am. Rev.*, LIII. 175-211. 1841.
- Errett, Isaac, A. M., LL. D. Walks about Jerusalem: a search after landmarks of primitive Christianity. St. Louis, 1884.
- (Everett, Hon. Alex. Hill, LL. D.) The Ancient Egyptians. (Review of the works of Sir J. G. Wilkinson and of Champollion the younger.) *Southern Quar. Rev.*, II. 5-55.
- Fairall, Rev. H. H., A. M. The Crusades. *The Holy Land. A Magazine*, etc., I. 27-30. Chicago, 1871.
- Field, Henry Martyn, D. D. On the Desert. With a brief review of recent events in Egypt. N. Y., 1883.
- Among the Holy Hills. N. Y., 1884.
- Fish, Henry Clay, D. D. Bible Lands Illustrated. Phil., 1876.
- Fisk, Pliny. The Holy Land, etc. Sermon. Boston, 1819.
- Freese, Jacob R., M. D. The Old World. Palestine, Syria and Asia-Minor. Travel, incident, description and history. Phil., 1869.
- Gage, William Leonard, D. D. Home of God's People. Hartford, 1874.
- The Land of Sacred Mystery; or, the Bible read in the light of its own Scenes. Hartford, 1871.
- Studies in Bible Lands. Boston, Am. Tract Soc. 1869.
- The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula. By Carl Ritter. Translated and adapted to the use of biblical students. Edinburg, 1866.
- Gillett, C. R. Pithom: Naville and his Reviewers. *Old Test. Student*, VI. 139-145. 1887.
- Gilman, Arthur, A. M. The Story of the Saracens, from the earliest times to the fall of Bagdad. N. Y. and Lond., 1887.
- Green, William Henry, D. D., LL. D. Lepsius and Brugsch's Travels in Egypt. *Prim. Rev.*, XXVII. 655-680.

- Assyrian Cuneiform Inscriptions. *Princeton Rev.*, XLIV. 516-536.
- The Persian Cuneiform Inscription a Key to the Assyrian. *Ibid.*, XLV., 274-291.
- Assyrian Monuments and the Bible. *Ibid.*, XLVI., 381-413.
- Gridley**, Rev. Wayne. Present Condition of Palestine, or the Holy Land. *Southern Quarterly Rev.*, IX. 285-320. 1846.
- Griswold**, Louise M. A Woman's Pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Notes of a tour through Europe and the East. With illustrations. Hartford, 1871.
- Guernsey**, Alfred H. The Hebrew Exodus—Sinai. *Harper's Monthly*, XLV. 35-46. 1872. (Review of Palmer's "Desert of the Exodus.")
- Hackett**, Horatio Balch, D. D., LL. D., Illustrations of Scripture; suggested by a tour through the Holy Land. Boston, 1855.
- A Journey to Neapolis and Philippi. *Bib. Sac.*, XVII. 866-898.
- Biblical Notes. *Bib. Sac.*, XXIII. 515-522; XXIV. 176-181.
- Exploration in Palestine. *Bib. Sac.*, XXVII. 570-574.
- Notes of a Week in Palestine. *Christian Rev.*, XIX. 343-361. 1854.
- Scripture Facts and Illustration collected during a journey in Palestine. *Ibid.*, XVIII. 405-424, 517-537.
- Geographical Accuracy of the Bible. *Ibid.*, XX. 451-469. 1855.
- Notice of Coleman's Historical Text-book. *Ibid.*, XIX. 614-616.
- Hale**, Edward Everett, D. D. The Holy Land. *Unit. Rev.*, XIII. 97-105, 433-449. 1880.
- Harman**, Henry Martyn, D. D. A Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land. 1869-70. Phil., 1873.
- Harper**, Robert F. Some Corrections to Cylinders A and B of the Esarhad-don Inscriptions as published in I and III Rawlinson. *Hebraica*, III. 177-185. 1887.
- Harriman**, Walter. Travels and Observations in the Orient, and a Hasty Flight in the Countries of Europe. N. Y., 1883.
- Haupt**, Prof. Paul. Assyrian Phonology with special reference to Hebrew. *Hebraica*, I. 175-181. 1885.
- Watch-ben-Hazael. *Hebraica*, I. 217-231. 1885.
- Hawks**, Francis Lister, D. D., LL. D. The Monuments of Egypt; or, Egypt a Witness for the Bible. Illust. N. Y., 1850.
- Hibbard**, Freeborn Garretson. Geography and History of Palestine. N. Y., 1857.
- Hitchcock**, Hiram. The Explorations of Di Cesnola in Cyprus. *Harper's Monthly*, XLV. 188-208. 1872.
- Holland**, Rev. Frederick West. Egypt in 1852. *Chr. Examiner*, LII. 51-68.
- Present Condition of Palestine. *Ibid.*, LIII. 178-201. 1852.
- Cairo and Damascus. *Lippincott's Mag.*, VII. 197-212.
- Scenes in Palestine by a Pilgrim of 1851. Boston, 1852.
- Howe**, Fisher. Oriental and Sacred Scenes. From Notes of Travel in Greece, Turkey and Palestine. N. Y., 1856.
- The True Site of Calvary; and suggestions relative to the Resurrection. Map. N. Y., 1871.
- Hubbell**, Rev. Henry Lynes, A. M. Palestine Explorations. *Hours at Home*, IV. 225-231. 1868.
- Hurlbut**, Jesse Lyman, D. D. Manual of Biblical Geography. A text-book on Bible History. Illustrated with accurate views of the principal cities. With an introduction by J. H. Vincent, D. D. Chicago, 1884.
- Hurst**, John Fletcher, D. D., LL. D. The Palestine of to-day. *Harper's Mthly.*, LX. 44-57. (Review of Thomson's "Land and Book.") 1880.
- Jessup**, Miss Anna H., and Mr. Frank S. Woodruff, Editors. El Arz (The

- Cedars). An account of a journey taken to the Cedars of Lebanon in September, 1886, by the "American Seecedar Association." Beirut, 1886.
- Jessup, Henry Harris, D. D.** Syrian Home Life. N. Y., 1874.
- The Cedar Groves in Mount Lebanon. *Hours at Home*, iv. 404-414, 499-506. 1868.
- Jessup, Rev. Samuel.** Husn Sulayman. (Palestine Exploration Society No. 2. Second Statement, Sept., 1873, pp. 26-38.) Hackensack, N. J., 1873.
- Johnson, Jeremiah Augustus.** The Colonization of Palestine. *The Century*, II. 293-296. 1882.
- On the Orintes. *Harper's Mthly.*, XLV. 385-399.
- Cyprus afloat and ashore. *Scribner's Monthly*, III. 177—
- To Damascus by Diligence, *Ibid.*, XIV. 137—
- The Colonization of Palestine. *Ibid.*, XXIV. 243—
- Syrian Rambles :—I. The Fountains of Syria. II. From Beirut to Sidon. III. The Sources of the Jordan. IV. The Lake and River of Palestine. V. A day on the other side of Jordan. VI. Summer Life in the Lebanon. VII. Ahmed Agha, the Janizary. *Hours at Home*, VIII. 301-309, 506-514; IX. 5-14, 131-141, 197-205, 293-303, 490-498.
- The Bedouin Arabs. *Hours at Home*, x. 228-240.
- Oriental Weddings. *Ibid.*, XI. 26-31.
- Education in Syria. *Ibid.*, XI. 131-131, 244-251, 327-331.
- Johnson, Samuel.** Oriental Religions and their relation to Universal Religion. With an Introduction by O. B. Frothingham. Persia. Boston, 1885.
- Johnson, Sarah Barclay.** Hadji in Syria; or, Three Years in Jerusalem. Phil., 1858.
- Jones, George, A. M., Chaplain U. S. Navy.** Excursions to Cairo, Jerusalem, Damascus, and Baalbec from the United States ship Delaware, during her recent cruise, with an attempt to discriminate between truth and error in regard to the sacred places of the Holy City. N. Y., 1836.
- King, Jonas, D. D.** Extraits d'un ouvrage écrit vers la fin de l'année 1826 et au commencement de 1827, sous le titre de Coup d'œil sur la Palestine et la Syria, accompagné de quelques reflexions sur les missions évangéliques. Athens, 1859.
- Συνοπτική ἐπιθεώρησις τῆς Παλαιστίνης καὶ Συρίας, μετὰ τινῶν σκέψεων περὶ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν Ἀποστολῶν, συγγραφείσα περὶ τὰ τέλη τοῦ 1826 καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν 1827 εἰς. Athens, 1859.
- Kirkland, John Thornton, D. D., LL. D.** Letters on the Holy Land. *Christian Examiner*, XXII. 262-269. 1837.
- Kittredge, Rev. Josiah Edwards, D. D.** Bible History in the Light of Modern Research (an address delivered at the inauguration of the Chautauqua Archeological Society, Aug. 14, 1880). Geneseo, N. Y., 1880.
- Laurie, Thomas, D. D.** Dr. Grant and the Mountain Nestorians. Boston, 1853.
- Journal of a visit to the Yezidees, with a description of the Excavations at Khorsabad. *Bib. Sac.*, v. 148-171. 1848.
- Testimony of Assyrian Inscriptions to the Truth of Scripture. *Bib. Sac.*, XIV. 147-166. 1857.
- Mount Lebanon. *Bib. Sac.*, XXVI. 541-572, 673-713. 1869.
- Review of the Identification of Mount Pisgah. *Bib. Sac.*, XXXIII. 132-153. 1876.
- What Wine shall we use at the Lord's Supper? *Bib. Sac.*, XXVI. 163-183. 1869.
- Bible Illustrations from Bible Lands. *Bib. Sac.*, XXXVI. 534-560, 617-664. 1869.
- The Ely Volume. Boston, 1881.

- Lee**, Prof. John Stebbins, D. D. Recent Explorations in Palestine. (Review of the recovery of Jerusalem.) *Univer. Quarterly*, XXVIII, 318-334.
- Leech**, Harry Harewood. Letters of a Sentimental Idler from Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and the Holy Land (in 1866-67.) N. Y., 1869.
- Lynch**, Lieut. Wm. F. Official Report of the United States Expedition to explore the Dead Sea and the Jordan. Baltimore, 1852.
- Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea. Maps and illustrations. Phil., 1849.
- Lyon**, Prof. David Gordon, Ph. D. (Leips.) Keilschrifttexte Sargon's Königs von Assyrien (722-705 v. Chr.) nach den Originalien neu herausgegeben, umschrieben, übersetzt und erklärt. Leipsic, 1883.
- An Assyrian Manual for the use of Beginners in the Study of the Assyrian Language. Chicago, 1886.
- Assyrian Research and the Hebrew Lexicon. *Bib. Sac.*, XLI, 376-385. 1884.
- Lyons**, J. L. The Wines of Syria. *Harper's Monthly*, XLIV, 539-541.
- MacCabe**, James D., Jr. Pathways in the Holy Land; or, Palestine and Syria, with account of Jerusalem, Nazareth, etc. Phil., 1875.
- McColister**, Sullivan Holman, D. D. Afterthoughts of Foreign Travel in Historic Lands and Capital Cities. Boston, 1883.
- McGarvey**, Prof. John William, A. M. Lands of the Bible. A geographical and topographical description of Palestine, with letters of travel in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. (Remarkably interesting, thorough and trustworthy.) Sixteenth thousand. Phil., 1882.
- Palestine Exploration; What remains to be done. *Old Testament Student*, VI, 69-70. 1886.
- McKenzie**, Alexander, D. D. Of the Holy Land. *And. Rev.*, I, 244-253. 1884.
- Mead**, Charles Marsh, Ph. D., D. D. El Mohrakah; or the place of Elijah's Sacrifice. *Bib. Sac.*, XXX, 672-696.
- Mendenhall**, J. W. Echoes from Palestine. Cincinnati, 1883.
- Merrill**, Selah, D. D., LL. D. East of the Jordan. A record of travel and observation in the countries of Moab, Gilead and Bashan, during the years 1875-1877. With introduction by Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D. N. Y. and Lond., 1881.
- Galilee in the times of Christ. With an introduction by Rev. A. P. Peabody, D. D. Boston and Lond., 1881.
- The Site of Calvary. Jerusalem, 1886.
- East of the Jordan, Beth Gamul. *Palestine Expl. Fund Quar. Stat.*, 47-55. 1876.
- Expedition East of Jordan. *Ibid.*, 177-181. 1876.
- Gilead, River Jabbok, Jordan Valley. *Ibid.*, 150-154. 1877.
- Succoth and Pennel. *Ibid.*, 81-88. 1878.
- Modern Researches in Palestine. *Ibid.*, 138-154. 1879.
- The Large Millstone on the Shittim Plain. *Ibid.*, 236-238. 1883.
- Newly-discovered Church at Jerusalem. *Ibid.*, 238-242. 1883.
- A Puzzle in Josephus—Two Gad-aras or one? *Ibid.*, 237-240. 1884.
- A Relic of the Tenth Legion. *Ibid.*, 132. 1885.
- The Inscription at Arak el Emir. *Ibid.*, 133. 1885.
- The Stations of David's Census Officers. *Ibid.*, 134-137. 1885.
- New Discoveries in Jerusalem. Tombs in the Hill of Jeremiah's Grotto. Tomb of Endocia. *Ibid.*, 222-228. 1885.
- Recent Discoveries in Jerusalem. The Second Wall. *Ibid.*, 21-24. 1886.

- Newly-found Inscriptions at Jerusalem. *Ibid.*, 72. 1886.
- Galilee in the Time of Christ. *Bib. Sac.*, XXXI. 29-73, 235-265. 1874.
- A June Day in Jerusalem. (A translation.) *Ibid.*, 528-544. 1874.
- Assyrian and Babylonian Monuments in America. *Ibid.*, XXXII. 320-349. 1875.
- The Site of Ur of the Chaldees. *Ibid.*, 377-380. 1875.
- Recent Assyrian Discoveries. *Ibid.*, 715-735. 1875.
- Identification of Succoth and Peniel. *Ibid.*, XXXIV. 742-754. 1876.
- Archæologist's Reports. *Palestine Expl. Soc. Fourth Statement*, pp. 29-100. N. Y., 1877.
- Modern Researches in Palestine. *Bulletin Am. Geog. Soc.*, No. 5, 1877.
- Pilgrim Caravans in the East. *International Review*, 639-647. 1878.
- Biblical Geography Illustrating Bible History. Seven articles in *Pilgrim Quarterly*. Boston, 1880-1.
- Newly-discovered Antiquities in Nablous. *London Athenæum*, 603-4. Nov., 1882.
- Disappearance of Ancient Walls. *Ibid.*, 635-36. 1882.
- Condition of Palestine. *U. S. Consular Reports*, 408-411. 1882.
- Fruit Culture in Palestine. *Ibid.*, 1884.
- Talitim Hodshi and Dan Jaan, 2 Sam. XXIV. 6. *Presbyterian Review*, 414-417. 1883.
- Sunday in Jerusalem. *S. S. World*, XXIII, No. 9. 1883.
- Climate and Rain-fall in Palestine. *Monthly Weather Review*, War Dept., Washington, vol. XI., 1883.
- Five Parts of Picturesque Palestine. N. Y., 1883.
- Temperance in Palestine. *S. S. World*, XXIV., 1884.
- Condition of Labor and the Laboring Classes in Palestine. *U. S. Special Labor Reports*. 1884.
- Discoveries at Jerusalem. *Am. Antiq. and Oriental Journal*, VI. 46-52. 1884.
- Jerusalem; Population, Religion, Poverty. *O. T. Student*, v. 97-103. 1885.
- The Site of Calvary. *Andover Review*, v. 483-488. 1885.
- Sixty-six Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Eastern Palestine. Revised by Prof. F. D. Allen. *Am. Jour. of Philology*, II. No. 2.
- Natural History of Palestine. *London Athenæum*, 52-53. July, 1886.
- Salt Mountain of Palestine. *Scientific American*, Sept., 1886.
- Birds of Palestine. *Luncz's Year Book*. Jerusalem, 1887.
- Millard, David. A Journal of Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petraea and the Holy Land. Rochester, N. Y., 1843.
- Moffat, James Clement, D. D. Egyptology. (Review of Bunsen's "Egypt's Place in Universal History.") *Princeton Review*, XXVIII. 715-732.
- Egypt in the Time of Abraham. *Princeton Review*, XXIX. 391-
- Montagne, Edward P. Narrative of the Late Expedition to the Dead Sea; from a diary by one of the party. Colored maps of Holy Land. Phil., 1849.
- Moore, J., Jr. Outlying Europe and the nearer Orient (a narrative of recent travel). Phil., 1880.
- Morris, Edward Joy. Notes of a Tour through Egypt to the Holy Land. Phil., 1842.
- Morris, Robert, LL. D. Youthful Explorers in Bible Lands. Joppa and Jerusalem. Chicago, 1870.
- Bible Witnesses from Bible Lands. (The above work re-edited.) N. Y., 1874.
- The Holy Land. A magazine of current information upon Oriental Geography, Geology, Archaeology, Natural History, Languages, and the Manners and Customs of the East, so

- far as they illustrate the Biblical narrative. Chicago, 1871.
- Mott**, Valentine, M. D. Travels in Europe and the East, embracing observations made during a tour through Great Britain, Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, Turkey, in the years 1834-41. N. Y., 1842.
- Myers**, Philip Van Ness, A. M. Remains of Lost Empires: Sketches of the ruins of Palmyra, Nineveh, Babylon, and Persepolis, with some notes on India and the Cashmerian Himalayas. N. Y., 1886.
- Newman**, John Philip, D. D., LL. D. From Dan to Beersheba. (1861.) N. Y., 1868.
- Nilan**, Rev. James. The Religion of Ancient Egypt. (Review of Renouf's lectures.) *Catholic World*, XXXIX. 557-564. 1884.
- O'Connor**, J. F. X., S. J. Cuneiform Text of a recently discovered Cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, from the original in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Woodstock, Md., 1885.
- The Cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar at New York. *Hebraica*, I. 201-208. 1885.
- Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar. Variants of an Unpublished Duplicate of the New York Cylinder. *Hebraica*, III. 166-170. 1887.
- Olin**, Stephen, D. D., LL. D. Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petraea, and the Holy Land. N. Y., 1843.
- Olmstead**, Prof. Denison, LL. D. Meteorology of Palestine. *New Englander*, XVII. 450-468.
- Oshorn**, Prof. Henry Stafford, LL. D. Ancient Egypt in the Light of Modern Discovery. Cincinnati, 1883.
- Chart of the Books of the Bible. Presenting recent discoveries in Egypt and Assyria. Oxford, Ohio, 1886.
- Landscape Map of Egypt, Sinaitic Peninsula and Palestine, by H. S. O. and Lyman Coleman, D. D. Phil., 1874.
- Little Pilgrims in the Holy Land. N. Y., 1859.
- Manual of the Entire Geography of Scripture. With notices of discoveries to the present time and with the accepted pronunciation. Oxford, O., 1886.
- Map Notes, intended to accompany the Landscape Map. Phil., 1874.
- Map of Palestine and Part of Syria (6 ft. x 9½). Oxford, Ohio, 1886.
- Map of Western Asia (Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea). Oxford, Ohio, 1886.
- Palestine, Past and Present. With biblical, scientific and literary notes. N. Y., 1858.
- Teacher's Guide to Palestine. N. Y., 1886.
- Osgood**, Howard, D. D., LL. D. Egypt before B. C. 2000. *Old Test. Student*, v. 161-166, 213-219. 1885-6.
- Owen**, Prof. Richard, LL. D. The Geology of the Holy Land. *The Holy Land*, a magazine, etc., I. 23-26. Chicago, 1871.
- Paine**, Prof. John Alsop, Ph. D. Nahr el Kelb. Greek inscriptions. With notes by the Rev. Howard Crosby, D. D. *Palestine Expl. Soc.*, No. 2. *Second Statement*. N. Y., 1873.
- Identification of Mount Pisgah. *Palestine Expl. Soc. Third Statement*, pp. 3-90. 1875.
- Natural History. A list of plants collected between the two Zargas, Eastern Palestine, in the spring of 1873. *Palestine Expl. Soc. Third Statement*, pp. 93-130. 1875.
- An Index of Arabic Names, found in the foregoing articles, together with the Plan of Transliterating. *Ibid.*, pp. 133-148. 1875.
- Succoth and Pennel not yet identified. *Bib. Soc.*, XXV. 481-498. 1878.
- The True Mount Lebanon: The

- name an index to the place; scriptural testimony to the place. *Jour. of Chr. Philosophy*, II. 365-379, 437-520. N. Y., 1883.
- Pharaoh, the Oppressor, and his Daughter, in the light of their Monuments. *Cen. Mag.*, N. Y., 1887.
- On a Thesis affirming Cairo to be the Biblical Zoan and Tanis Magnum. *Am. Oriental Soc.*, May, 1885.
- On the Ancient Name of Cairo in Egypt. *Ibid.*, Oct., 1885.
- Paine, Prof. Timothy Otis, LL. D.** Solomon's Temple; or the Tabernacle; First Temple; House of the King, or House of the Forest of Lebanon; Idolatrous High Places; the City of the Mountain (Rev. XXI.); the Oblation of the Holy Portion; and the Last Temple. With 21 plates of figures. Boston, 1861.
- Solomon's Temple and Capitol, Ark of the Flood and Tabernacle, or the Holy Houses of the Hebrews, Chaldees, Syriac, Samaritan, Septuagint, Coptic and Itala Scriptures; Josephus, Talmud and Rabbis. 42 plates, 120 ents. Boston, 1885.
- Parish, Elijah.** Sacred Geography; or a gazetteer of the Bible. With maps. Boston, 1813.
- Paxton, Rev. John D.** Letters on Palestine and Egypt, during 1836, 7, 8. Lexington, Ky., 1839.
- Phelps, Sylvanus Dryden, D. D.** Holy Land, with glimpses of Europe and Egypt. A years tour. N. Y., 1864.
- Philbrick, Edward Southwick.** Travels in Egypt and the Holy Land. (A very instructive journal of observation, by an intelligent layman.) *New Jerusalem Mag.*, XXVIII.—XXXIV. 1855-62.
- Prime, Samuel Iremus, D. D.** Travels in Europe and the East. N. Y., 1855.
- Prime, William Cowper.** Boat Life in Egypt and Nubia. N. Y., 1865.
- Tent Life in the Holy Land. N. Y., 1857.
- An American at Sinai. *Harper's Monthly*, XVI. 609-624.
- The Holy City. *Ibid.*, XIV. 577-591.
- Passages of Eastern Travel. *Ibid.*, XII.; XIII.; XIV.
- From Sinai to Wady Mousa. *Ibid.*, XVI. 736-751.
- Starlight on Bethlehem. *Ibid.*, XIV. 229-232.
- Voyage of Paul. *Ibid.*, XVII. 745-759.
- To Medina and Mecca. *Ibid.*, XIV. 174-196.
- Sketches of Old Thebes. *Ibid.*, XIV. 319-333.
- From Thebes to the Pyramids. *Ibid.*, XIV., 463-477.
- Wines of Palestine. *Ibid.*, XIV. 375-379.
- The Sea of Galilee. *Hours at Home*, I. 438-442. 1865.
- Prince, Samuel J.** Travels in Europe and the East... Palestine and Egypt. N. Y., 1855.
- Ragozin, Mme. Zinaida (Zénaïde) Alexeyevna.** The Story of Chaldea from the Earliest Time to the Rise of Assyria. N. Y., 1886.
- The Story of Assyria. (In press.)
- Randall, Rev. David Austin.** The Handwriting of God in Egypt, Sinai, and the Holy Land: The records of a journey from the Great Valley of the West to the Sacred Places of the East. Phil., 1867.
- Reed, Sampson.** Egyptian Hieroglyphics. *New Jerusalem Mag.*, IV. 69-76. 1830-31.
- Ridgeway, Henry Bascom, D. D.** The Lord's Land: A narrative of travel in Sinai, Arabia Petraea and Palestine, from the Red Sea to the entering in of Hamath. N. Y., 1876.
- Robinson, Charles Seymour, D. D., LL. D.** The Pharaohs of the Bondage and Exodus (lectures). N. Y., 1887.
- Robinson, Edward, D. D., LL. D.** Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount

- Sinai and Arabia Petraea. A journal of travels in the year 1838, by E. Robinson and E. Smith. 3 vol. Boston, 1841.
- The Bibliotheca Sacra; or Tracts and Essays on topics connected with Biblical Literature and Theology. N. Y., 1843.
- Later Biblical Researches. N. Y., Lond., 1856.
- Physical Geography of the Holy Land. Boston, 1865.
- Editorial Articles. *Bib. Sac.*, *passim*.
- Rogers, Mary Eliza. Domestic Life in Palestine. Cincinnati, 1865.
- Ryder, William Henry, D. D. Palestine. *Univer. Quar.*, VIII. 137-155. 1851.
- Egypt and the Bible. *Univer. Quar.*, X. 329-360.
- Salisbury, Prof. Edward Elbridge, LL. D. Identification of the Signs of the Persian Cuneiform Alphabet. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, I. 1849.
- Tour from Oroomiah to Mosûl through the Kourdish Mountains and Visit to Nineveh. *Ibid.*, II. 1850.
- Remarks on Two Assyrian Cylinders received from Mosûl. *Ibid.*, V. 1853.
- Contributions from Original Sources to our Knowledge of Muslim Tradition. *Ibid.*, VII. 1855.
- Samson, George Whitfield, D. D. Geographical Notes on the Land of Goshen. Notes of a tour of eleven days from Cairo through the Land of Goshen to Suez. *Christian Rev.*, XIV. 141-166, 445-460; XV. 214-236. 1849.
- Egyptian Archaeology. *Ibid.*, XVIII. 258-270. 1851.
- Schaff, Philip, D. D., LL. D. Through Bible Lands. Notes of travel in Egypt, the Desert and Palestine. *Am. Tr. Soc.* N. Y., 1879.
- Disputed Scripture Localities. *Princeton Rev.*, new series, I. 851-884.
- Sehliemann, Dr. Henry. Ilios, the city and country of the Trojans. The results of researches and discoveries on the site of Troy and throughout the Troad, in the years 1871, '72, '73, '78, '79; including an Autobiography of the Author. N. Y., 1881.
- Troja. Results of the latest researches and discoveries on the site of Homer's Troy, and in the Heroic Tumuli and other sites, made in the year 1882, and a narrative of a journey in the Troad in 1881. N. Y., 1883.
- Sears, Robert. Two hundred Pictorial Illustrations of the Holy Bible, consisting of views in the Holy Land, together with many remarkable objects mentioned in the Old and New Testaments. N. Y., 1841.
- Seyffarth, Prof. G., Ph. D., D. D. Theologische Schriften der Alten Aegypten nach dem Turiner Papyrus zum ersten Male nebersetzt. Gotha, 1855.
- Berichtigungen der roemischen griechischen persischen aegyptischen hebraischen Geschichte und Zeitrechnung Mythologie und alten Religionsgeschichte auf Grund neuer historischer und astronom. Huelfsmittel. Leipsic, 1855.
- Articles in *Trans. Acad. of Science*, St. Louis, I.: Notice of a Burnt Brick from the ruins of Nineveh (64-66); A remarkable Seal in Dr. Abbot's Museum at New York (249-266); An Astronomical Inscription concerning the year 1722 B. C. (356-386); A remarkable Papyrus Scroll written in the Hieratic character about 1050 B. C. (527-569).
- Smith, Eli, D. D. An Ancient Temple on Mt. Lebanon. *Bib. Sac.*, first series, 557-563. 1843.
- A visit to Antipatris. *Ibid.*, 478-496.
- Researches in Palestine. Compiled from various communications . . . from Revs. E. S. and Samuel Wolcott. *Ibid.*, 9-88.

- Turkish Toleration. *Bib. Sac.*, III. 390.
- Outlines of a journey in Palestine. *Ibid.*, x. 113.
- Wines of Mt. Lebanon. *Ibid.*, III. 385.
- Smith, Jerome Van Crowninshield, M. D. Pilgrimage to Palestine. Boston, 1853.
- Smith, Samuel Alden. Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals, Königs von Assyrien (668-626 v. Chr.) nach dem selbst in London copirten Grundtext mit transcription, Übersetzung, kommentar und vollständigem glossar. Leipzig, 1887.
- Spencer, Jesse Ames, D. D. The East. Sketches of travel in Egypt and the Holy Land. N. Y., 1850.
- Stebbins, Rufus Phineas, D. D. Manners and Customs of Ancient Egypt. *Chr. Examiner*, XXXI. 39-60. 1841.
- Stephens, John Lloyd. Incidents of travel in Egypt, Arabia Petrea and the Holy Land. N. Y., 1837.
- Strong, Edward, D. D. The Monuments of Egypt. Review of the work of Dr. F. L. Hawks. *New Englander*, IX. 1-14.
- Taylor, Bayard. The Lands of the Saracens; or, Pictures of Palestine, Asia Minor, Sicily and Spain. N. Y., 1869.
- Egypt and Iceland in the year 1874. N. Y., 1882.
- Taylor, Prof. John Phelps. Modern Glimpses of Assyrian Art. *Andover Rev.*, II. 269-278. 1884.
- Thayer, Alexander Wheelock. The Hebrews and the Red Sea. Andover, 1883.
- Thomas, Joseph. Travels in Egypt and Palestine. Phil., 1853.
- Thompson, Joseph Parrish, D. D., LL. D. Articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*: Recent exploration of the Dead Sea (XII. 528-558); Topography of Jerusalem (XV. 444-475); Egyptology, Oriental Archaeology and Travel (XX. 650-660; XXXI. 425-435, 666-669; XXII. 684-689); Notes on Egyptology (XXIV. 771-775; XXVI. 185-191, 577-585; XXVII. 180-184; XXVIII. 397-402; XXIX. 771-774; XXX. 775-780; XXXII. 185-197; XXXIV. 537-546).
- Palestine. *North Am. Rev.*, CXIII. 154-.
- Geog. of Pal. by E. Robinson. *Ibid.*, LXXXV. 87-119.
- Chronology, Topography and Archaeology of the Life of Christ. XCVII. 74-101.
- Palestine a perpetual witness for the Bible. *New Englander*, XVII. 192-223.
- A Museum of Christian Art. *New Englander*, XXVII. 239-257.
- Chronology of Egypt. *North Am. Rev.*, XCVI. 111.
- Definite Results of Egyptology. *The Nation*, V. 5, 6.
- Thompson, William McClure, D. D. The Land and the Book; or, biblical illustrations drawn from the manners and customs, the scenes and scenery of the Holy Land. N. Y., 1860.
- The Land and the Book. I. Southern Palestine and Jerusalem. II. Central Palestine and Phœnicia. III. Lebanon, Damascus, and beyond Jordan. N. Y., 1880.
- The Land and the Book. Popular Edition. N. Y., 1880.
- Journal of a Visit to Safet and Tiberias. *Missionary Herald*, Boston, 1837.
- Articles in *Bibliotheca Sacra*: The Sources of the Jordan, the Lake el Huleh and the adjacent country (III. 185-214); Antiquities on the route from Baalbek to Hamath and Aleppo (IV. 403-412); Tour from Beirût to Aleppo in 1845 (V. 1-23, 243-262, 447-480); Inscriptions at Beirût (V. 587-592); Journey from Aleppo to Mount Lebanon by Jebel el-Aala, Apamia, Ribla, etc. (V. 663-700); Notes of the route from Beirût to Damascus (V. 760-770); The A'waj the Second River

- of Damascus (vi. 366-386); Notes on Palestine (xii. 822-833); The Physical Basis of our Spiritual Language (xxix. 1-22; xxx. 95-128; xxxi. 136-158; xxxii. 19-35; xxxiii. 401-424.)
- Trowbridge**, Rev. Tillman Conklin. Armenia and the Armenians. *New Englander*, xxxiii. 1-14.
- Trumbull**, Henry Clay, D. D. Kadesh Barnea: its importance and probable site, with the story of a hunt for it; including studies of the route of the Exodus and the Southern Boundary of the Holy Land. N. Y., 1884.
- The Blood Covenant. A primitive rite and its bearings on Scripture. N. Y., 1885.
- Tyler**, William Seymour, D. D., LL. D. Representative Cities: 1, Damascus; 2, Tyre; 3, Jerusalem; 4, Athens; 5, Alexandria; 6, Rome. *Hours at Home*, iv. 314-324, 506-515; v. 25-36, 193-203, 339-347, 481-491; vi. 275-285. 1868.
- Underwood**, Francis Henry. The true story of the Exodus of Israel, together with a brief view of the history of Monumental Egypt. Compiled from the works of Dr. Henry Brugsch-Bey. Boston, 1880.
- Upham**, Thomas Cogswell, D. D. Letters Æsthetic, Social and Moral, written from Europe, Egypt and Palestine. Private Edition. Brunswick, Me., 1855.
- Van Lennep**, Henry John, D. D. Bible Lands. Their Modern Customs and Manners. N. Y., 1875.
- Vincent**, John Heyl, D. D., LL. D. Little Footprints in Bible Lands. N. Y., 1861.
- Pictorial Bible Geography. N. Y., 1870.
- Wainwright**, Jonathan Mayhew, D. D., D. C. L. The pathways and abiding places of our Lord; illustrated in the journal of a tour through the Land of Promise. N. Y., 1851.
- The Land of Bondage. A journal of a tour in Egypt. N. Y., 1852.
- Ward**, Aaron. Around the Pyramids; being a tour in the Holy Land, and incidentally through several European countries, and portions of Africa, during the years 1859, '60. N. Y., 1863.
- Ward**, William Hayes, D. D., LL. D. Articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*: Assyrian Studies (xxvii. 184-191. 1870); Inscription of Mesha King of Moab (xxvii. 625-646-777, 778); The Serpent-temple in Oriental Mythology (xxxviii. 209-230. 1881).
- Report on the Wolfe Expedition to Babylonia, 1884, '85. Papers on the Archaeological Institute of America. Boston, 1886.
- Sippara. *Hebraica*, ii. 1886.
- Warner**, Charles Dudley. From Jaffa to Jerusalem; Jerusalem; Holy Places of the Holy City; Neighborhoods of Jerusalem; The Fair of Moses; The Armenian Patriarch. *Atlas Monthly*, xxxviii. 1-14; 143-154, 301-309, 418-430. 1876.
- In the Levant. Boston, 1882.
- Warren**, Israel Perkins, D. D. Jerusalem, Ancient and Modern. Outlines of its History and Antiquities. To accompany Selous' two great pictures of Jerusalem as it was and as it is. Boston, 1873.
- Warren**, William Wilkins. Life on the Nile and excursions on shore between Cairo and Asuan. Also a tour in Syria and Palestine in 1866, '67. (Printed by the author for private circulation). Paris, 1867.
- The same. 2d edition. Boston, 1873.
- Wells**, Thomas. Letters on Palestine; or, Sketches of Travel along the Eastern Shores of the Mediterranean. Boston, 1846.
- Wells**, Prof. William. The Regeneration of Palestine. *Meth Quar.*, lxii. (1th series xxxii.) 646-666.

- Whitney, Rev. George Henry, A. M. Hand-book of Bible Geography. N. Y., 1871.
- Williams, Rufus Orland. Egypt and the Book of the Dead. *Univ. Quar.*, XXXIII, 398.
- Wolcott, Samuel, D. D. Articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*: Notices of Jerusalem (first series, 17-87. 1843); Topography of Jerusalem (XXIII. 684; XXIV. 116; XXVII. 565); The Site of Sodom (XXV. 112); The Land of Mo-riah (XXV. 765).
- Topography of the City (A Review of Fergusson's Theory.) *Smith's Bib. Dic.*, Am. Ed., pp. 1330-1337.
- Review of Olin's Travels. *No. Am. Review*, LVII. 496.
- Wood, William Spicer. An Eastern Afterglow, or present aspects of sacred scenery. Cambridge, 1880.
- Woodruff, Prof. Frank Edward. The el Fayoum Manuscripts, with a résumé of the discussion concerning the alleged Gospel fragment. *Andover Review*, IV. 272-277.
- Worcester, Rev. John. A Journey in Palestine in the Spring of 1882. Boston, 1884.
- General Views of Palestine and of its Representation. *New Jer. Mag.*, (new series,) VII. 447-450. 1883.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.—The foregoing list of American writers on subjects connected with Biblical Exploration, being a first attempt at such a collection, is necessarily incomplete; but it may furnish suggestive material for better work in the same direction. The attempt is to record under the name of each writer all the works and the articles which have appeared in reviews, magazines and other permanent volumes of periodical literature. Want of space forbids the insertion of a much larger list which might have been gathered from the columns of religious journals. The compiler will be grateful to any who will send him corrections or additions to this list for future use.

IS THE CURRENT CRITICAL DIVISION OF THE PENTATEUCH INIMICAL TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH?

BY PROF. WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D. D., LL. D.,

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT for May, page 259, copies a paragraph from the *Presbyterian Review* containing the following sentences:

"The analysis of the Hexateuch into several distinct original documents is a purely literary question in which no article of faith is involved. Whoever in these times, in the discussion of the literary phenomena of the Hexateuch, appeals to the ignorance and prejudices of the multitude, as if there were any peril to the faith in these processes of the higher criticism, risks his reputation for scholarship by so doing."

Two remarks are naturally suggested by these words.

1. Truth is to be accepted at all hazards. If the first six books of the Bible are really compounded of the several documents which the critics profess to discover in them, we must admit the fact and make the best of it. No doubt the Christian faith will survive, whatever happens.

2. Nevertheless there are good reasons why those who reverence these books as an integral portion of the inspired Word of God and who believe them to be a truthful and reliable record, should not be overhasty in accepting critical conclusions which are based upon and necessarily involve the opposite assumption.

The bearing of the divisive hypothesis upon the credibility of the Pentateuch and the inspired authority of the Bible as a whole is obvious. If the great leader and legislator of Israel himself recorded the marvelous transactions in which he took so conspicuous a part, and those laws which he is expressly said to have written, or which God is said to have directly imparted to him, then we have the highest possible guarantee of the truth and accuracy of the statements and of the verity and divine authority of the legislation; and then, too, the declarations of all the subsequent scriptures both of the Old Testament and of the New upon this subject are completely justified. But recent critics claim that the professed record of the history and legislation of Moses is based upon different documents of unknown origin and of uncertain age, which have been compacted together by a redactor or series of redactors, of whom nothing whatever is known. If these documents were the products of contemporaries of and participants in the events described, and there was evidence that they had been fairly dealt with and faithfully transmitted, the case would not be so bad. But whatever diversities exist among the critics as to the age, authorship and tendencies of these supposed documents, their unanimous verdict is that the earliest of them was not written until several centuries after the Mosaic age.

Moreover, these documents give, it is claimed, not only varying but mutually inconsistent accounts of the persons and events which they describe, and this not only in subordinate and unessential particulars, but in matters of the greatest moment. And they have been put together in such a manner as to give an entirely different complexion to things from that which either of the documents taken singly aimed to give. Their incompatible statements have been harmonized in an unwarrantable manner, and their divergent accounts of the same event have been converted into distinct events, showing that the redactor misunderstood or misrepresented his sources. His misconceptions would have been of less consequence if he had preserved the documents entire and unaltered, so that adequate means would have been possessed for forming an independent judgment of their contents. But, on the showing of the critics themselves, the documents have been preserved in a mutilated form, that only being retained by the redactor which seemed to him suited to his purpose; and this was often modified considerably from its original intent by the new connections in which it was placed; and certain passages were besides seriously altered or additions made which still further obscure the genuine signification. So that he who would arrive at the real truth respecting the matters treated in the Pentateuch, must first ascertain and expunge what has been inserted by the redactor, and restore what he has changed to its previous form. He must then discover and correct the modifications to which the documents have been subjected in the various editions through which they are severally alleged to have passed. When this task has been successfully accomplished, and what is left of the documents has been restored in each case to its primitive form, these will put the investigator in possession of all that now remains of the traditions which were circulating about the Mosaic age six or more centuries subsequently. From these mutually contradictory legends he must evolve the facts. And this is the sort of voucher we have for the revelations made to Moses, and the institutions founded by him, which are the basis of the Old Testament religion and the foundation on which the New Testament likewise rests.

When in this condition of things it is said that the analysis of the Pentateuch

is a purely literary question, in which no article of faith is involved, it is difficult to attach any intelligible meaning to the words. To speak of inspired documents and an inspired redactor as factors in this critical hypothesis is to use language that is altogether misleading. The Pentateuch so constructed can only be said to be inspired by attaching such a sense to this term as will render it applicable to a mass of very unreliable materials, in which legends, misstatements and contradictions largely figure. If the church is to take her idea of the Word of God from what the Pentateuch becomes under the operation of this critical hypothesis, what becomes of its divine authority? And what becomes of the infallibility of Christ's teachings, who gave to it his own supreme sanction?

In the article from which the extract in the May number of this journal was taken, students are referred to "the completed works of Wellhausen, Reuss, Kuenen, and Dillmann" in their study of this question. It may be presumed that these leaders of critical opinion understand the bearing of the hypothesis of which they are the most distinguished advocates; and almost every page of their writings furnishes evidence of the readiness with which the truthfulness and reliability of the sacred records are dissipated in the critical crucible. The whole thing is in a state of flux. The critic disposes of facts and institutions and written records at will. Everything goes down before his analysis; and this is being constantly pushed further and further. Seams and flaws hitherto unsuspected are opening with every fresh application of critical tests. The Pentateuch is not only rent into four documents, new strata and further divisions are detected in the body of each separate document. When the limit of ultimate divisibility will be reached, none can tell. And what will be the end of the process, or how much will be left of Moses and of his institutions when it is finished, it is impossible to foresee. It really seems as though the critical documents, by the further application of the same methods that produced them, were on the verge of dissolution, and a reign of chaos approaching that of the old fragmentary hypothesis might be at hand. How far it is proposed to follow the critics into this dismal slough does not appear. There are no very clear signs of faltering yet.

It may be said that we should distinguish between the analysis of the critics and their deductions from it; the former may be accepted and the accuracy of the latter denied. We may admit the four documents that they find, and claim that though these are divergent, as the four gospels are, in their mode of presentation, they are, nevertheless, harmonious and mutually consistent. It would seem that this is the only attitude that believing scholars can consistently take, if in their opinion the existence of the Pentateuchal documents has been established. But if they accept the critical analysis in its current form, they will be as hopelessly entangled by their admissions as the fly that has unwarily ventured into the spider's parlor. The ready-made scheme of Pentateuchal documents proffered by the critics is throughout based upon and pervaded by gratuitous assumptions at war with the truth of the sacred record,—assumptions of doublets which are purely imaginary, of senses at variance with the existing context which are brought about by dislocations and hypothetical connections, of oppositions inferred from a silence which has itself been created by critical severances, of manipulations by the redactor justifying the summary ejection of whatever proves intractable by less violent means.

It is a first principle of fair and candid dealing that an honest and capable witness is to be believed unless there are positive reasons for discrediting his testi-

mony. Assuming the existence of the documents and the redactor, it ought to be firmly maintained that the latter, who had the documents in full before him, had the opportunity of knowing their genuine signification as the modern critic, who has them only in an incomplete state, cannot possibly do. Unless, therefore, his integrity or good sense (not to speak of his inspiration) can be successfully impeached and on valid grounds, it should be insisted upon that, however he may have combined or transposed his sources, he has faithfully preserved their original and proper meaning. If this be maintained, as the simplest regard to sound interpretation undoubtedly requires, the critical scheme now current will be found faulty at a thousand points, and Pentateuchal analysis will be completely shorn of its destructive qualities. Let the analysis be conducted on purely literary grounds, and apart from the sinister presuppositions that have been adverted to, and it may have the freest scope as in reality a literary question, in which no article of faith is involved. No one need object to an analysis which shall classify and re-arrange the materials according to their literary features, if it but leave them all unimpaired and retain their true and proper signification. But this would be a totally different affair both in its principles and its results from the current critical scheme, which discredits the Pentateuch at every turn by converting it into a repository of discordant traditions.

It does not annul the inherently vicious character or the evil tendencies of this hypothesis that men revered for their learning and piety have of late signified their acceptance of it, and that they consider its adoption compatible with whatever is essential to the Christian faith. It is a remarkable phenomenon that in European universities eminent biblical scholarship has been to so great an extent dissociated from faith in the Scriptures in any evangelical sense. We may wisely employ the Philistines to sharpen our spears and our swords; but we cannot join them in an assault upon the camp of Israel. No more perilous enterprise was ever attempted by men held in honor in the church than the wholesale commendation of the results of an unbelieving criticism in application both to the Pentateuch and to the rest of the Bible, as though they were the incontestable product of the highest scholarship. They who have been themselves thoroughly grounded in the Christian faith may, by a happy inconsistency, hold fast their old convictions while admitting principles, methods and conclusions which are logically at war with them. But who can be surprised if others shall with stricter logic carry what has thus been commended to them to its legitimate issue? If it be true that the great body of those who lead in biblical scholarship have been swept away by the recent popularity of this critical craze, it may be well to remember that questions of truth and right are not to be settled by the majority of voices, but by the strength of the arguments. And they who are slightly referred to as in a "hopeless minority," may derive some consolation from the thought that they have the infallible declaration of our Lord and his apostles and the inspired word on their side, and that a great array of former scholars, fully equal in all respects to any who have since swerved from their footsteps, have constructed defences which no ingenuity of perverted learning will ever be able to overthrow.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

JUNE 12. THE COMMANDMENTS. Exod. XX. 1-11.

JUNE 19. THE COMMANDMENTS. Exod. XX. 12-21.

What we call the "ten commandments," are currently called in the Hebrew text "the ten words," (see Exod. XXXIV. 28; Dent. X. 4 and IV. 13, the article being used in all three places). The words of the Hebrew stem *çāwā*, commonly translated by the English verb "command" and its derivatives, are not currently used to denote what we call "the ten commandments," and are, perhaps, not even once used, distinctively, in this meaning. This special meaning of the word "commandment" is purely a matter of translation-usage, and not of Hebrew usage. And it is a use of language so fixed in the habits of most of us, that we need to watch ourselves very closely to keep from being misled by it.

What is thus true of the term commandment, as applied to "the ten words," is perhaps even more emphatically true of the term "law" in the same application. We are accustomed, and correctly, so far as the ethical aspects of the matter are concerned, to regard "the ten words" as being pre-eminently *the* law of Jehovah, as recorded in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, neither the Old Testament nor the New are accustomed to apply the term law distinctively to "the ten words;" it is doubtful whether they so apply it in even a single instance. In Exod. XXIV. 12, for example, we make a good sense if we regard the words law and commandment as in apposition with "the tables of stone," but there is no grammatical necessity for thus regarding them. "The ten words" are a portion of the commandments of Jehovah; they are found in the law of Jehovah; they are an especially important part of the law and the commandments; but it is not according to biblical usage to call them either by the name law or by the name commandments.

This is the more noteworthy because the Bible, instead of signaling their importance by applying these two names to them, has other names which it uses for this purpose. It speaks of "the two tables of the *testimony*," Exod. XXXI. 18; XXXII. 15, etc., and of "the tables of the *covenant*," Dent. IX. 9, 11, 15; Heb. IX. 4, etc. The Bible regards "the ten words," indeed, as precepts to be obeyed; but it far more prominently regards them as the foundation and evidence of special privileges accorded to Jehovah's people—as a charter of rights, rather than a code of prohibitions.

"The ten words" are not the only decalogue in this part of the Pentateuch; critical scholars have shown that many of the other laws, especially those now found nearest "the ten words" in Exodus, are given in groups of tens or of fives.

One reading only the account of the giving of "the ten words" now found in Deuteronomy, would doubtless get the impression that they were first given orally, then presently afterward written by the finger of God, then destroyed and re-written, and then immediately placed in the ark, which had previously been

prepared for that purpose. If he afterward read the account in Exodus, he would find that it contradicted, in several points, the impressions he had formed from reading Deuteronomy. On closer examination, he would find that there is no real contradiction between the accounts, but that, for lack of information, he had misunderstood some of the statements of Deuteronomy. If, pursuing the study, he took pains to put the two accounts together, he would reach substantially the statement of the matter that will be presently given; and in doing this, he would incidentally reach one or two critical conclusions of great importance. The account in Exodus is not such an account as any writer would ever have derived, by any process whatever, from that in Deuteronomy; the statements in Deuteronomy are precisely such as a writer might have taken from Exodus, provided he assumed that his readers were familiar with the Book of Exodus, or with the events there recorded. There is strong evidence that the writer of Deuteronomy was familiar, not only with those parts of the Exodus account of "the ten words" which the critics assign to the older prophetic writers, but also with those parts which they assign to the various strata of the priest-code. In other words, the Exodus account, as a whole, bears decided marks of being earlier than the first two discourses in Deuteronomy. This is one instance of a large group of critical phenomena bearing strongly against the theories now largely prevalent. Another and simpler instance occurs within the limits of our lessons; the fourth commandment presupposes the account of the creation given in the first chapter of Genesis; the critical scientist must either accept this as conclusive against the theory that the first chapter of Genesis was written several hundred years later than the twentieth of Exodus, or else he must proceed to re-adjust the phenomena, so as to make them fit the theory.

The order of events which the authors alike of Exodus and of Deuteronomy had in their minds, and intended to convey to their readers, is the following: First, "the ten words" were audibly spoken from Sinai; then Moses received the various precepts recorded in Exod. XXI.-XXIII., now commonly described as the covenant-code; then, Exod. XXIV. 1, 2, Moses was directed to come up into the mountain, but first wrote the "book of the covenant," rehearsed it to the people, obtained their assent to it, and solemnized the occasion by a sacrifice and the sprinkling of blood, Exod. XXIV. 3-8; then he went up into the mountain, and after forty days received the first pair of tables; still later, he received the second pair, after the first were broken; and when at length the ark was made he put them in the ark, and the ark in its place in the sanctuary-tent.

The author of this part of Exodus certainly intended us to understand that "the ten words" were included in the book of the covenant that Moses read to the people; otherwise, directly after saying "God spoke all these words," to wit., "the ten words," he would not have continued by saying that Moses recounted to the people "all the words of Jehovah," as well as "the judgments," and that he wrote "all the words of Jehovah," and that the people replied, "all the words that Jehovah spoke we will do." Moreover, "the ten words" are habitually spoken of as the basis of Jehovah's covenant with Israel; the two tables were the tables of the covenant; the ark in which they were kept was the ark of the covenant; it is hardly possible that they were omitted from this covenant-book and covenant solemnization made just after they were given. The book of the covenant may very naturally have included "the ten words," the covenant-code, and the narrative concerning them; but whatever else it included, it certainly did not

omit "the ten words;" to have left them out would have been like leaving Christ out of the gospels.

It follows from this that the original of our present copies of "the ten words" is the copy that Moses wrote in the book of the covenant, and not the copy that God wrote, some months later, on the second pair of tables of stone. The two versions of the decalogue, in Exodus and Deuteronomy, are not two discrepant copies from the original copy in stone, proving that scribes took liberties even in transcribing so divine a document, making careless or willful changes in it. "The ten words" in Deuteronomy are a changed version, rather than a changed transcription of "the ten words" in Exodus; and we have no means of comparing either of them with "the ten words" as written on either pair of tables. The significance of the tables lies not in the supposed fact that they contained the first writing of "the ten words," from which all other copies were transcribed, but in the fact that they were authenticated by their divine handwriting, just as any charter of a people is authenticated by the signature of the sovereign, and that they were therefore to Israel the voucher given by God himself, of the reality of their covenant with him.

It is an important point gained in criticism thus to differentiate every statement made concerning the tables of stone from any statement anywhere made concerning sacred writings by Moses or by any other man; the only point of contact they have lies in the fact that there was a Mosaic copy of "the ten words," as well as a divine copy. And this view of the case is made prominent, not only in the accounts of the origin of the tables, but in those of the arrangements made for their care and custody. The law was kept beside the ark, the pot of manna and other national memorials, before the ark, but only the two tables within the ark, 1 Kgs. viii. 9; 2 Chron. v. 10. The attempt to prove from Heb. ix. that the pot of manna and Aaron's rod that budded had once been in the ark, but were lost before the building of the temple, is based upon a mechanical exegesis, rather than upon a search for the intended meaning of the author. It is as if one should insist upon the grammatical construction of the reporter's statement that certain parties had put up a building 216 feet long, capable of accommodating 76 men, four stories high. The two tables were kept, not for purposes of study or appeal (it was death to look into the ark), but as a testimony, as sacred divine credentials; the law, on the other hand, was in the custody of the priests and elders for purposes of administration. The reputed origin of the two was not more diverse than the use regularly made of them.

The two tables, in the ark, with the mercy-seat over them, forming the central object of the sanctuary and its worship, represent the moral principle of the religion of Israel. God's covenant with Israel, as with any man in all time, is on the basis of the keeping of the "ten commandments;" yet there is propitiation for the repentant man, who is conscious of sin because he has failed to keep them. This two-fold symbol is to the religion of the Pentateuch what the life and death of Christ are to Christianity—a fixed standard of obligation, coupled with a proclamation of forgiving grace.

JULY 3. THE INFANT JESUS. Matt. ii. 1-12.

The student who wishes to examine for himself into the relations between the Old Testament and the New, will find the Gospel by Matthew, on the whole, better adapted to his purpose than any other book of the New Testament. Let

one begin, for example, by comparing the Greek forms of the proper names, Matt. i. 1-16, with that of their Hebrew originals; let him compare the list here given with that in the Old Testament history, noting especially the omissions, and trying to account for them; let him explain the three fourteens of generations mentioned in verse 17; let him compare *γένεσις*, verses 1 and 18, with the Greek name of the first Old Testament book; in verses 18-25, let him note the expressions "Holy Spirit," "just man," "Angel of the Lord," "appeared," the allusion in verse 21, the quotation in verse 23, the etymologies given for the names Jesus and Emmanuel; let him look up with especial care the Hebrew equivalent of the word Christ, and its use in the Old Testament. If he thus makes a beginning, he will find points for comparison multiplying themselves before him. He will find the second and the succeeding chapters as rich as the first. He should especially watch the verb-tenses, and the genitives and the articles, testing them sometimes by translation into Hebrew or Aramaic. It is particularly true that some scholars ought to do this kind of work with especial reference to some future revision of our Revised Bible; but it is also true that work of this sort would be peculiarly fruitful for purposes of practical exegesis, bringing us closer to the accurate meaning of the New Testament, and making that meaning vivid and picturesque for us.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

As a result of recent discussion, two of the leading institutions in New England, Yale and Amherst, offer for next year optional courses in the study of biblical literature, or in other words, of the English Bible. This is not devoid of significance. If such work is to be undertaken in colleges of this rank, it will not be long till the literary study of the Bible shall occupy an honored and established place in the curriculum of every college. The movement will be a rapidly growing one. A beginning has been needed and has come. The end will not be far away.

From the present outlook the Summer Schools of Hebrew promise to be much larger during the coming summer than ever before. The number of persons applying for information, as well as the number already enrolled, as compared with the same date a year ago, is more than double. It is especially noteworthy that a larger number of college students will be present. The desirability of learning the principles of the Hebrew language before entering the seminary is now quite generally appreciated. The fact that no tuition-fee is charged will make it possible for many to attend the schools who would otherwise be unable to do so.

The exact site of Capernaum, the central place of Christ's activity in Galilee, has been a vexed problem among Palestine explorers ever since the inauguration of a thorough and scientific study of the Holy Land, and indeed earlier. Two localities claim the honor of being that famous city, namely, what is now called Châm Minje, on the western border of the lake, and Tell Hâm, on its northern extremity, near where the Jordan enters. The authority of Robinson has induced many to accept Châm Minje as the original Capernaum. But against this, later investigators have adduced weighty reasons. The last one to join the ranks of the advocates of Tell Hâm, or rather to renew his allegiance, is Franz Delitzsch, in the third edition of his "A Day in Capernaum," recently issued in German. His arguments are both negative and positive. Negatively, he shows that, aside from a single tradition of unknown age and very doubtful value, there is really nothing that speaks for Châm Minje. On the other hand, this identification is open to the serious objection that Capernaum is by the New Testament reported as lying where the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun join. From biblical, as also from rabbinical sources, it appears that this boundary line can have been only at the northern edge of the lake, where the great ruins of Tell Hâm are found. It is indeed noteworthy that the fate of the three cities over which Christ uttered his woes, should have been so terrible. Capernaum is a mass of ruins, and its site disputed, although when it was destroyed does not seem fixed; Chorazin was already in ruins in the days of the church historian Eusebius, and Bethsaida was destroyed so effectually a few years later that its site can no longer be identified.

The April number of *The Scottish Review* contains an article on "The Apocryphal Character of the Moabite Stone," by the Rev. A. Loewy, in which the claim is made that King Mesha's inscription is a forgery. The author of the article begins by giving a short history of the discovery of the stone, and a list of the scholars who have published its text. After this short introduction, the author plainly and pointedly states his own view, viz., that the stone is a forgery to be classed with those of Shapira and Firkowicz. One of the chief reasons leading Loewy to this conclusion is—in his own words—the following: "Whilst the surface of the stone is pitted and indented in consequence of its exposure to varying influences extending perhaps over thousands of years, the characters inscribed on the stone have in no instance suffered from similar influences, because the DRESSED SURFACE IS ANCIENT, WHEREAS THE INSCRIPTION ITSELF IS MODERN." Loewy, although an octogenarian, is a novice in palæography, and is not in a position to speak with authority on this part of the subject.

After this claim, according to which Clermont-Ganneau, De Vogüé, Nöldeke, Levy, Euting, Neubauer, Geiger, Derenbourg, Merx, Stade, Smend and Socin have all been blind to the same forgery, Loewy gives a copy of the inscription, with his own peculiar transliteration, and a translation. This is followed by a critical (?) analysis of each word and idiom, in which the author claims that the language and style is not what would be expected, and hence that the stone is a fraud. The arguments then are (1) the modern appearance of the engraved letters and the aged appearance of the stone itself; (2) the language and style of the inscription. Taking into consideration that Mr. Loewy is only a talmudical scholar of no very high order, it will be well for us to retain our former views as to the authenticity of the inscription until some abler scholar and *palæographer* enters the ranks of those who would regard it as a forgery.

"Advanced thought" is a term that is used and abused a great deal in our day. In itself it implies nothing that is objectionable. In truth, the idea naturally associates with itself commendable features. It means an advance upon a position previously occupied. And indeed much of what, in theology and in other fields, is called advanced thought, is commendable. The theologian is not simply to reproduce what the fathers have believed and taught; his work is not one of mere memory. Much as we revere the memories and the faith of the Christian fathers of different centuries, we must not forget that they too were mortals and did not see and understand everything that the word of God teaches. It is the peculiarity of this word that new features of its truth are opened up to every successive generation; and it is certainly no violation of modesty to say that the best Christian scholars in our day are in advance of what their predecessors knew. No one can dispute the fact that we know more of biblical history, archaeology, chronology, philology, etc., than was known a hundred years ago; and it is at least a debatable question whether the study of biblical theology in our day has not shed a clearer light upon the character and historical contents of the revealed word than did the one-sided cultivation of dogmatics in the hands of those who constructed the great theological systems. There is, then, a perfectly legitimate use of the term "advanced thought," namely, progress in the study and understanding of the truth. Of course, not everything labeled "advanced

thought" is such. Men who do not advance in the paths of truth, but depart from them, cannot claim to be in advance of their predecessors, as they have gone in an altogether new direction. To call their movement "advanced" is a misnomer. But *abusus non tollit usum*, and it would certainly be lamentable if the abuse of such words as "critics," "higher criticism," "advanced thought," and the like, should prejudice the minds of men against the claims of legitimate and correct theological science. Conservative scholarship should protest against allowing the advocates of biblical science, falsely so called, to abuse such terms for purposes of their own.

The attempt has frequently been made to show the dependence of this or that biblical book for its thoughts or style upon the profane literature of the ancients. This has been the case chiefly with the New Testament, and here again it is the Logos idea of John which has often been claimed to have been drawn from the philosophical speculations of Philo. In the Old Testament, attempts of this kind have been restricted to Ecclesiastes, which has been interpreted, or misinterpreted, as teaching a Greek philosophy filtered through a Jewish mind. Among the Apocrypha of the Septuagint, the Wisdom of Solomon has been the favorite book selected as a connecting link between sacred and profane literature. A new move in this direction has been made by Professor Ed. Pfeiderer, who has issued a monograph on the teachings of the famous philosopher Heraclitus, of Ephesus. While he thinks that Ecclesiastes shows the influence of the philosophy of Heraclitus, he does not think that this can be proved. However, his influence on the Wisdom of Solomon he considers proved beyond a doubt. He maintains that this is so negatively and positively. Wisdom is stated to combat Heraclitus in the latter's deification of fire (xiii. 2), in his esoteric exclusiveness in not being willing to spread wisdom (vi. 21-24; vii. 13, 14); in his false view of death (i. 12-16); in his friendly attitude to the immoral mysteries (xiv. 22-31). The positive influences are to be seen in the sixteenth chapter of Wisdom, where one of the leading thoughts of Heraclitus' philosophy has been made use of, especially in v. 21. Professor Schürer, of Giessen, in discussing these problems, states (1) that an acquaintance of the author of Wisdom with the works of Heraclitus is possible; (2) that an indirect influence of Heraclitus upon his writings is not only possible, but even is, in a certain degree, something to be expected, as the author of Wisdom is well acquainted with the Stoic philosophy of the Greeks, hence also in all probability with the system of Heraclitus. But no reasons can be adduced for going any further and maintaining more than this indirect and general influence. The efforts of Pfeiderer to show that this system has had a marked influence on the Gospel of John and other early Christian literature, Schürer pronounces to be without any foundation whatever.

>BOOK : NOTICES.<

TWENTY-ONE YEARS' WORK IN PALESTINE.*

Every Bible-student has heard something of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Its works are constantly cited. Organized in 1865, for the purpose of conducting "systematic and scientific research in all branches of inquiry connected with the Holy Land," with special view to the illustration of the Bible, its work has gone on regularly and continuously during this period, and the results accomplished are of a number and character which only the professional student can appreciate. This work is intended as a popular resumé of the work of the society, and as such certainly fills an important place. After indicating the work originally proposed and the principles in accordance with which it was to be conducted, the writer gives us a brief history of the management, the amount of money received and expended. There follow brief yet interesting accounts of the "first expedition," "the excavations at Jerusalem," "the desert of the exodus," the surveys of Western and Eastern Palestine, the geological survey, and the monuments of the country. A chapter is given to the memory of those of the society's officers who died in the work. In the final chapter an indication is given of the work which lies immediately before the society, and for which it asks additional funds. That part of the work in which least has been done is in relation to the manners and customs of the people. In this department the society promises publications at an early date. Whatever may be the basis for the severe criticism of the society's work by Professor Socin a year or so ago, sufficient has been accomplished to entitle the society and its officers to the everlasting gratitude of all students of the Sacred Word.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE.†

The preceding volumes of this work—truly a great one in many senses—have already been noticed. Critical students must not lose sight of the fact that there is a depth of meaning in the biblical narratives which the cold analytical method of study does not reach. If the word "meaning" is here too definite, we may perhaps substitute "suggestion." To a mind like that of Dr. Parker the simple narratives of Scripture and its peculiar phraseology are wonderfully suggestive. A certain expression starts him on a line of thought which is rich and deeply spiritual. His admonitions are pointed; his exhortations are effective; his teachings are most wholesome; but whether such a method of treating the Bible is, everything considered, the best, may, perhaps, be questioned.

* TWENTY-ONE YEARS' WORK IN THE HOLY LAND (A RECORD AND A SUMMARY): June 22, 1865—June 22, 1886. London: *Richard Bentley & Son*. 1886. 8vo, pp. 232. Price, \$1.40.

† THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture, by Joseph Parker, D. D. Vol. V. Joshua—Judges V. New York: *Funk & Wagnalls*, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1887. 8vo, pp. 360. Price, \$1.50.

HAM-MISHKAN—THE WONDERFUL TENT.*

This book, as well as those elsewhere noticed in this number, is intended not for scholars and critics, but for the people. The writer endeavors to depict the structure of the tabernacle, its purpose and its teachings. The presentation aims to be succinct, definite and clear; and the author has endeavored to do this without "indulging too much in fanciful and extravagant interpretations."

A perusal of the book produces the impression that, in both of these particulars, the writer has failed. The presentation is anything but succinct and definite. The method employed, that of a conversation between several travelers, rendered a succinct presentation impossible. One reads through entire pages before obtaining what might often have been more satisfactorily expressed in as many lines. It is difficult to know what standard of interpretation the author held before himself. Anything more fanciful or extravagant than much which this book contains would be difficult to find.

THE BIBLE-WORK: OLD TESTAMENT.†

The general purpose of this work is seen from its title. It is something like Spurgeon's work on the Psalms, "The Treasury of David." It shows wonderful care and industry. The good judgment displayed in making the selections is everywhere manifest. The arrangement of the material, however, does not seem to accord with the principles which the writer lays down in his preface. Does it not seem premature, to say the least, that an exhaustive treatment of the doctrine of the trinity should be introduced in connection with Gen. 1. 26 and 11. 7. We cannot believe that the plural in "let us make man," etc., has any allusion to this doctrine. But so long as Bible-students desire to know what great and good men through all ages have thought and written concerning the Bible, and have not time or opportunity to consult the works of these men, there will be a field for this book. The author is certainly to be congratulated upon the courage which enables him to undertake a work of such vast proportions.

* HAM-MISHKAN, THE WONDERFUL TENT. An account of the structure, signification and spiritual lessons of the Mosie Tabernacle. By Rev. D. A. Randall, D. D. With a portrait and sketch of the author. Cincinnati: *Robert Clarke & Co.* 1886. 12mo, pp. 420. Price, \$1.75.

† THE BIBLE-WORK: THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. I. Genesis—Exodus XII. From Creation to the Exodus. The revised text, arranged in sections; with comments selected from the choicest, most illuminating and helpful thought of Christian centuries, taken from four hundred scholarly writers. Prepared by J. Glentworth Butler, D. D. New York: *Funk & Wagnalls.* 1887. Large 8vo.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Einleitung in die kanon. Bücher d. A. T.* Von W. Schenz. Regensburg. 1887. xv, 480 S., gr. 8.
- Kanonisirung u. Feststellung des Textes der heiligen Schriften des A. T.* Von A. S. Weissmann. Vienna. 1887. 8vo, pp. 20 (Hebrew).
- Die Bedeutung des Pask f. die Quellenscheidung in den Büchern des A. T.* By E. V. Ortenberg. Progr. d. Königl. Dom Gymnasiums. Verden. 1887.
- Das Sklavenrecht d. alten Testaments.* Eine rechtsgeschichtl. Studie. By M. Mandl. Hamburg: J. F. Richter. 1886. 32 S., gr. 8... M. 80.

ARTICLES.

- Haggai.* By Rev. Marcus Dods, D. D., in *Expositor*, '87.
- The Prophecy concerning Judas.* By T. E. Page, M. A., ib.
- The Red Sea.* By Prof. H. P. Smith in *Journal and Messenger*, May 18, '87.
- The Crossing of the Red Sea.* By Samuel C. Bartlett in *Independent*, May 19, '87.
- Finding Pharaoh.* By Edward L. Wilson in *Century Magazine*, May, '87.
- Pharaoh, the Oppressor, and his Daughter, in the light of their Monuments.* By Prof. John A. Paine, ib.
- The Pharaoh in the time of Joseph.* By S. Fyne in *Jewish World* (London), April 29, '87.
- Is the Moabite Stone a Forgery?* By Dr. K. Kohler in *American Hebrew*, May 6, '87.
- Recherches bibliques.* IX. *Cainites et Séthites.* By J. Halévy in *Revue des études juives*, '87, jan.-mars.
- Indisches in der Bibel.* By M. Haberlandt in *Oesterr. Monatschr. f. d. Orient*, 1887, 3.
- Étude critique sur l'authenticité du Pentateuque d'après l'examen intrinsèque de son contenu.* By F. Vigouroux in *Rev. des questions histor.* April, '86.

- Ueber Jesaja LIII. 9.* By J. H. Findeisen in *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben*, '87, Heft III.
- Historical Verity of the Biblical Record of Israel in Egypt.* 1. By Prof. George Ebers in *S. S. Times*, April 30, '87.
- God in the Old Testament.* By F. N. Zabriskie, ib.
- Modern Observances of the Passover by the Jews.* By Dr. Henry Gersoni, ib., May 7.
- The Great and Terrible Wilderness.* By Prof. George E. Post, ib., May 21.
- Recent Red Sea Theories.* By Prof. Hermann Guthe, ib., May 14 and 21.
- The Border Wall of Egypt.* By H. Clay Trumbull, ib., May 14.
- The Manna.* By Prof. Isaac H. Hall, ib., May 21.
- The Tables of the Covenant.* Ib., May 28.
- The Ten Words.* 1. By Prof. Chas. A. Briggs, ib.
- The First and Great Commandment.* By Prof. Geo. R. Stevens, ib.
- The Decalogue. Man and God.* By Alex. MacLaren, ib.
- L'Hébreu d'après M. Kuenen.* By A. Carrière in *Rev. de l'hist. des rel.*, 13, 206 sqq.
- Le code sacerdotal pendant l'exil.* By J. Halévy, ib.
- L'œuvre Esdras.* By A. Kuenen, ib., 13, 334 sqq.
- The Higher Criticism.* By J. C. Westcott in *Zion's Herald*, May 25, '87.
- Fruit Culture in Palestine.* By Dr. Selah Merrill in *Observer*, May 19, '87.

REVIEWS.

- Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua,* für die 2. Aufl. neu bearb. (Aug. Dillmann). By B. Stade in *Theol. Litzng.*, May 7, '87.
- Biblical Theology of the Old Testament* (Weidner). By Ad. Kamphausen, ib.

GENERAL INDEX.

American Explorers in Bible-Lands.....	273
American Institute of Hebrew, Report of the Principal of Schools of the....	178
" " " " Report of the Treasurer of the.....	185
" " " " The Annual Meeting of the.....	187
Antediluvian Chronology, The.....	175
Ballantine, Prof. Wm. G., A Book-Study: Isaiah XL.—LXVI.....	51
Barton, Geo. A., The Prayer of Habakkuk	176
Beecher, Prof. Willis J., The Sunday-School Lessons.....	
.....22, 47, 78, 113, 145, 170, 219, 246, 277, 319	
Bible, The Study of the, by College-Students.....	196
Bible-study in the Pastorate: Figures and Facts.....	131
Bibliography of Exploration, The. A List of American Writers upon Biblical Archæology and the Work of Exploration in Bible Lands, with the Subjects they have discussed, including Review and Magazine Articles as well as Separate Books.....	303
Boardman, Dr. Geo. Dana, The Antediluvian Chronology.....	175
Book Notices: <i>Bartlett and Peters</i> , Scriptures Hebrew and Christian, 29; <i>Blaikie</i> , A Manual of Bible History, 61; <i>Bradley</i> , Lectures on Ecclesiastes, 61; <i>Briggs</i> , Messianic Prophecy, 126; <i>Butler</i> , The Bible-work: The Old Testament. Vol. I. Genesis—Exodus XII. From Creation to the Exodus, 327; <i>Cheyne</i> , Job and Solomon, 254; <i>Chicago Theol. Sem. Professors</i> , Current Discussions in Theology, 253; <i>Conder</i> , Syrian Stone-Lore, 286; <i>Cook</i> , Orient, 253; <i>Kellogg</i> , Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt, 286; <i>Kuenen</i> , An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, 190; <i>Orelli</i> , The Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of the Kingdom of God, 28; <i>Parker</i> , The People's Bible: Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, 223; <i>Parker</i> , The People's Bible: Discourses upon Holy Scripture, 326; <i>Pember</i> , Earth's Earliest Ages, 62; <i>Randall</i> , Ham-mishkan, the Wonderful Tent, 327; — Twenty-one Years' Work in Palestine, 326; <i>Weidner</i> , Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, 31; <i>Wright</i> , Ancient Cities from the Dawn to the Day-light, 223.	
Book-study: Isaiah XL.—LXVI.....	51
Book-study: Part I. (Genesis I.—XI.).....	117
Book-study: Part II. (Genesis XII.—L).....	164
Book-study: Exodus.....	203
Book-study: Hosea.....	270
Brown, Prof. Francis, Commentaries on Exodus.....	84
Caphtorim, The. Who were these People and where was their Original Home?	213

Chambers, Dr. Talbot W., Divisions of the Pentateuch.....	5
The Perfection of the Decalogue.....	261
Chapter-study. Jacob's Blessing (Gen. XLIX.).....	79
Chinese Legends, Primeval.....	38
Critical Division of the Pentateuch inimical to the Christian Faith? Is the Current.....	315
Current Old Testament Literature... ..32, 64, 96, 128, 160, 192, 224, 256, 288, 328	328
Curtis, Prof. Edward L., The Old Testament Prophet.....	25
Some Features of Old Testament Prophecy illustrated by the Book of Amos.....	136
Decalogue, The Perfection of the.....	261
Delitzsch, Franz.....	209
Delitzsch, Prof. Franz, Must we follow the New Testament Interpretation of Old Testament Texts?.....	77
DeWette, W. M. L.....	154
Denio, Prof. F. B., The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament, I.....	55
The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament, II.....	71
A Book-Study: Hosea.....	270
Divisions of the Decalogue.....	5
Douglass, Benjamin, Esq., An Exposition of Isaiah LXIII. 11, 12.....	173
Editorial Notes: Activity in the Old Testament Department, 65: The advanced Views old, 227; Americans and Independent Research, 225; American Students, 280; Assyrian and its Contributions to Biblical Science, 226; The Bible in the College Curriculum, 194; Bible-study in the Pastorate, 129; Bible- study in the Seminary, 129; Prof. Chas. R. Brown on the Revision, 2; Cold Reception of the Revised Old Testament, 66; Capt. Conder's Vindication, 291; The Critical "and Mystical," 258; Danger of Bible-study by Student, 194; Devotional Study of the Bible, 34; Exegetical Work, 2; Explanation of "Figures and Facts," 161; Figures and Facts, 161; The Gospel in the Old Testament, 68; Hebrew Summer Schools, 3; Higher and Lower Criticism, 35; The Interest in the Bible, 193; False Interpretation, 257; Lyon's Article on Israelitish Politics, 291; The Minister's Use of the Bible, 3; Do Ministers devote sufficient time to Bible-study? 130; The Ministry not studious, 162; The Moabite Stone, 291; New Testament Interpretation of Old Testament Passages, 65; Non-appreciation of the Importance of Bible-study, 162; THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, 1; What THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT has accomplished, 257, 289; Preaching and Teaching, 33; Preachers as Students of the Bible, 35; The Prevalence of the so-called "Critical" Views, 259; The proposed Reconstruction of Israel's History and Religion, 67; Renewed Interest in Biblical Languages, 227; Reverent but Critical Study, 227; The proposed School of Biblical Archaeology and Philology in the East, 292; Sta- tistics, 225; Study abroad, 4; Study of the Bible by College Students, 193; Study of Biblical History, 66; Study of Biblical Languages, 66; Study of Prophecy,—its importance,—its difficulties,—interesting and fascinating,— the need of honest, scientific study,—the practical results, 97-100; The Work of Exploration, 258.	
Edkins, Rev. Dr. J., Primeval Chinese Legends.....	38
Elohim in Gen. I., The word.....	241
Everts, Rev W. W., Jr., W. M. L. DeWette.....	154

Exodus, Commentaries on.....	84
Foster, Prof. R. V., Hebrew Prophets and Prophecy, I.....	110
“ “ “ “ “ II.....	150
“ “ “ “ “ III.....	166
“ “ The word Elohim in Gen. I.....	241
Genesis I-III., The Literary Problem of.....	101
Genesis XIII. 10. The Incongruous Clause in.....	237
Gillett, Rev. C. R., Pithom: Naville and his Reviewers.....	139
Green, Prof. William Henry. Is the Current Critical Division of the Pentateuch inimical to the Christian Faith?.....	315
Habakkuk. The Prayer of.....	176
Hallen, Rev. A., The Caphtorim: Who were these People and where was their Original Home?.....	243
Harper, Prof Wm. R., A Chapter-study. Jacob's Blessing (Gen. XLIX.)....	79
“ “ A Book-study. Part I. (Gen. I.-XI.).....	117
“ “ Bible-study in the Pastorate: Figures and Facts....	131
“ “ Report of the Principal of Schools of the American Institute of Hebrew.....	178
“ “ The Study of the Bible by College-students.....	196
“ “ A Book-study: Exodus.....	203
Hebrew Prophets and Prophecy, I.	110
“ “ “ “ II.....	150
“ “ “ “ III.....	166
Hilprecht, Prof. Hermann, Franz Delitzsch... ..	209
Hovey, Pres. Alvah, Shekhar and Leaven in Mosaic Offerings.....	11
Isaiah LXIII. 11, 12, An Exposition of.....	173
Kingdom of God in the Old Testament, The, I.....	55
“ “ “ “ II.....	71
Lyon, Prof. D. G., Israelitish Politics as affected by Assyrian, Babylonian and Early Achæmenian Kings.....	293
Margin in the Old Testament Revision, Popular Uses of.....	229
McCurdy, Prof. J. F., Popular Uses of the Margin in the Old Testament Revision	229
McGarvey, Prof. J. W., Palestine Exploration: What Remains to be Done	69
Mitchell, Prof. Edward C., American Explorers in Palestine	213
“ “ “ American Explorers in Bible-Lands.....	273
“ “ “ The Bibliography of Exploration. A List of American Writers upon Biblical Archæology and the Work of Exploration in Bible Lands, with the Subjects they have discussed, including Review and Magazine Articles as well as Separate Books.	303
Moore, Prof. W. W., The Incongruous Clause in Gen. XIII. 10.	237
New Testament Interpretation of Old Testament Texts, Must we follow the?	77
New Testament Judaism and its Genesis.....	44
Old Testament Notes and Notices.....	92-95; 123-125; 156-159; 222; 250-252; 283-285; 323-325
Old Testament Prophet, The.....	25
Old Testament Prophecy illustrated by the Book of Amos, Some Features of	136
Pagan Religions, Ethical Value of.....	17

Palestine Exploration: What Remains to be Done.....	69
Palestine, How to see.....	58
Palestine, American Explorers in.....	213
Pentateuch Question, The—Recent Phases	268
Pithom: Naville and his Reviewers.....	139
Politics, Israelitish, as affected by Assyrian, Babylonian and Early Achæ- nian Kings.....	293
Psalms, To a Pastor who wishes to know how he may study the Book of, to his own best advantage and that of his Congregation, Letter I.....	235
Rameses the Great, Unrolling the Mummy of.....	26
Religion as an Element in Civilization ..	106
Schodde, Prof. Geo. H., New Testament Judaism and its Genesis	44
“ “ “ Genesis I.—III., the Literary Problem of.....	101
Shekhar and Leaven in Mosaic Offerings.....	11
Smith, Dr. Justin A., Ethical Value of Pagan Religions.....	17
“ “ Religion as an Element in Civilization.....	106
Smith, Prof. Henry P., The Pentateuch Question, Recent Phases.....	268
Sunday-School Lessons, The.....	22, 47, 78, 113, 145, 170, 219, 246, 277, 319
Weidner, Prof. Revere F., To a Pastor who wishes to know how to study the Book of Psalms to his own best advantage and that of his Congregation, Letter I.....	235







